arXiv:1404.5884v1 [math.GT] 23 Apr 2014

On the connectedness of the space of codimension one foliations on a closed 3-manifold

Hélène Eynard-Bontemps
IMJ - PRG, UPMC (Paris)
helene.eynard-bontemps@imj-prg.fr

Abstract

We study the topology of the space of smooth codimension one foliations on a closed 3-manifold. We regard this space as the space of integrable plane fields included in the space of all smooth plane fields. It has been known since the late 60's that every plane field can be deformed continuously to an integrable one, so the above inclusion induces a surjective map between connected components. We prove that this map is actually a bijection.

Key words: foliation, integrable plane field, 3-dimensional manifold, h-principle, deformation, homotopy.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 57R30.

Contents

1 From plane fields to foliations on the solid torus **6**

2 Flexibility of malleable foliations **11**
2.1 Almost-integrable plane fields and malleable foliations 12
2.2 Flexibility of taut almost integrable plane fields 13
2.3 Deforming families of taut almost integrable plane fields 17

3 Malleabilization of neat foliations **19**
3.1 Rolling up a torus leaf 20
3.2 Holonomy fragmentation 22

4 Density of neat foliations **24**
4.1 Neat foliations in terms of holonomy 24
4.2 Approximation result for foliations and holonomies 25

5 Appendix: Flexibility of almost integrable plane fields **27**
5.1 Reduction to open sets of the euclidian space 28
5.2 Almost horizontality and curvature 29
5.3 Triangulation and Key Lemma 30
5.4 Deformation model 31
5.5 Proof of the Key Lemma 5.4 37

In this article, we are interested in the topology of the space $\mathcal{F}(M)$ of (C^∞) smooth codimension one foliations on a closed 3-manifold M. We identify such a foliation with its tangent plane field, and hence regard $\mathcal{F}(M)$ as the subset of *integrable plane fields* inside the space $\mathcal{P}(M)$ of all plane fields on M, endowed with the usual C^∞ topology.

Most plane fields are not integrable: non integrable plane fields form a dense open subset of $\mathcal{P}(M)$. It has been known since the late 60's, however, that any closed 3-manifold admits a smooth codimension one foliation [Li, No]. Moreover, according to works of J. Wood [Wo] and W.P. Thurston [Th2], any smooth plane field can be deformed to a smooth foliation. In other words, the map $\pi_0\mathcal{F}(M) \stackrel{\iota_*}{\to} \pi_0\mathcal{P}(M)$ induced by the inclusion $\mathcal{F}(M) \stackrel{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{P}(M)$ is *surjective*. It is then tempting to ask whether this inclusion is actually a weak homotopy equivalence, or in Gromov's language whether *foliations satisfy the parametric h-principle*. In fact, such an h-principle was established by Y. Eliashberg [El] for a related class of (locally homogeneous) plane fields, namely overtwisted contact structures. We study here the validity of the *uniqueness* h-principle for foliations, and obtain the following:

Theorem A. *Let M be a closed oriented 3-manifold, $\mathcal{P}(M)$ the space of smooth transversely oriented plane fields on M and $\mathcal{F}(M)$ the space of smooth codimension one foliations on M. The inclusion of $\mathcal{F}(M)$ in $\mathcal{P}(M)$ induces a bijection between connected components.*

This improves the main result of the author's PhD dissertation [Ey]. We do not know, however, whether we have a bijection between *path*-connected components, i.e. whether the map $\pi_0\mathcal{F}(M) \stackrel{\iota_*}{\to} \pi_0\mathcal{P}(M)$ is *injective*. In $\mathcal{P}(M)$, which is locally contractible, connected and path-connected components are the same, but this is not clear in $\mathcal{F}(M)$, which is a closed subset with empty interior. More will be said on this matter in Section 4. Surjectivity between higher homotopy groups, on the other hand, is easier to obtain. The following result can be derived from our techniques and will be completely proved here for $k = 1$ (cf. Theorem C):

Theorem B. *Let M be a closed oriented 3-manifold, $\mathcal{P}(M)$ the space of smooth transversely oriented plane fields on M and $\mathcal{F}(M)$ the space of smooth codimension one foliations on M. For any $k \geq 1$, the map $\pi_k\mathcal{F}(M) \stackrel{\iota_*}{\to} \pi_k\mathcal{P}(M)$ induced by the inclusion is* surjective.

To present the strategy of the proof of Theorem A, we will first explain how to deform a *single* plane field ξ to a foliation. The argument we describe is due to Thurston [Th2], who later generalized it to higher dimensions and codimensions [Th3, Th4].

Thurston's method

Thurston's construction proceeds in three steps.

Step 1. First, we make ξ integrable outside a finite collection of balls (thought of as "holes" in the resulting foliation) on which it is *almost horizontal* (cf. Definition 2.1), meaning, basically, that it is tangent to the boundary sphere at exactly two points, the *poles*, and transverse to a vector field on the whole ball (tangent to the boundary) connecting the poles. In this article, such a plane field will be called *almost integrable* (cf. Definition 2.1). To do so, the idea is to construct a triangulation "in good position" with

respect to ξ, and to make ξ integrable in a neighbourhood V of its 2-skeleton. More precisely, we require all faces and edges to be transverse to ξ, and the direction of ξ to be almost constant on each 3-simplex. We then make ξ integrable in a neighbourhood of every vertex, then every edge, and finally every face. The key point is that, in a neighbourhood of every simplex σ of the 2-skeleton, there exists a nonsingular vector field ν tangent to ξ and transverse to σ. The deformation consists in making ξ invariant under ν in a neighbourhood of σ. Since ξ is already integrable near $\partial\sigma$, it is already invariant under ν there and thus remains unchanged. This guarantees the global coherence of these local perturbations. The neighbourhood V of the 2-skeleton can be chosen so that the complement of V is a collection of balls (one in each 3-simplex) on which ξ is almost horizontal.



Figure 1: Making ξ integrable near the 2-skeleton

Step 2. Due to the Reeb Stability Theorem, the restriction of ξ to such a ball B cannot be deformed (rel. ∂B) to a foliation, unless $\xi \mid_{\partial B}$ is a foliation by circles outside the poles. To get around this problem, the idea is to replace ball-shaped holes by toric ones by digging tunnels along transverse arcs in V connecting the poles from outside. A sufficient condition for such arcs to exist is that the foliation on V is *taut*, *i.e* that every transverse arc (in particular "meridians" connecting the poles of a ball) extends to a closed transversal, or equivalently that every leaf is crossed by a closed transversal. In that case, we will say that the almost integrable plane field ξ itself is *taut*. Thurston artfully reduces to this situation by "ripping" all leaves, making them spiral around new ball-shaped holes where he temporarily sacrifices the integrability (cf. Lemma 2.10 for a parametric version of this trick).



Figure 2: Thurston's trick

Step 3. We can now enlarge each hole by digging a tunnel (so far foliated by disks) along a transverse arc connecting its poles. We thus have a collection of solid toric holes outside which the plane field, still denoted by ξ, is integrable and on which ξ is transverse to the $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor of $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$. Thurston then shows that such a plane field on a solid torus can always be deformed to a foliation, relative to the boundary. This uses the simplicity of the group of smooth orientation preserving diffeomorphisms of the circle, due to M. Herman [He1]. P. Schweitzer later gave a more geometric filling argument in [Sc], also based on a theorem of Herman [He2], whose advantage, as A. Larcanché observed in [La], is that the



Figure 3: Enlarging the holes

resulting foliations depend continuously on their trace on the boundary. These foliations of the solid torus, which will be referred to as *Schweitzer foliations*, will be described more precisely in Section 1. Let us just say, for now, that they are transverse to the $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor of $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ *except* above two circles in $\mathbb{D}^2$ whose products by $\mathbb{S}^1$ are torus leaves bounding Reeb components. In particular, all leaves except these two are crossed by a closed transversal.

By construction, the foliations obtained by Thurston's process (combined with Schweitzer's filling method) are *malleable* in the following sense: a foliation is *malleable* (cf. Definition 2.3) if it is taut outside a finite collection of solid tori and induces, on each of these, a Schweitzer foliation whose trace on the boundary torus has a whole one-parameter family of (meridian) circle leaves. We will denote by $\mathcal{M}(M)$ the set of malleable foliations on M. Thus what Thurston's construction shows is that the map $\pi_0\mathcal{M}(M) \to \pi_0\mathcal{P}(M)$ induced by the inclusion $\mathcal{M}(M) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}(M)$ is *onto*.

Outline of the proof of Theorem A

The general idea to prove Theorem A is to try and give a relative one-parameter version of Thurston's construction: start with a continuous family ξ_t, $t \in [0,1]$, in $\mathcal{P}(M)$ such that ξ_0 and ξ_1 are integrable, and deform it (with fixed endpoints ξ_0 and ξ_1) to a family of integrable plane fields. This raises two major difficulties. First, there are a lot of choices involved in Thurston's process (triangulation, transverse arcs...), and it is not at all clear (and is actually wrong) that such choices can be made continuously with respect to the parameter t. But a perhaps bigger issue is the relative part of the problem: Thurston's process does not leave integrable plane fields unchanged! It deforms them (a great deal) to *malleable* foliations. So let us first restrict to the case when ξ_0 and ξ_1 are malleable, and then explain how to reduce to this case.

"Malleable case" (Section 2). As we just saw, the best we can expect from a (naive) parametric version of Thurston's construction is the following:

Theorem C (Malleable case)**.** *Any continuous path of plane fields connecting two malleable foliations can be deformed (with fixed endpoints) to a path of malleable foliations. In particular, the map* $\pi_0\mathcal{M}(M) \xrightarrow{\iota_*} \pi_0\mathcal{P}(M)$ *induced by the inclusion* $\mathcal{M}(M) \xhookrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{P}(M)$ *is* injective.

Remark. This also shows that the map $\pi_1\mathcal{M}(M) \to \pi_1\mathcal{P}(M)$ (for any choice of base point) is *onto* (see Theorem B).

Before sketching the proof of Theorem C, note that taut foliations (when they exist) are in particular malleable (cf. Definition 2.3), so the following statement is a direct corollary of the above:

Corollary C'. *Two taut foliations homotopic as plane fields are connected by a path of (malleable) foliations.*

Remark.

- This extends a result by Larcanché [La], who proved the above statement in the case of two sufficiently close taut foliations, and of two foliations transverse to the fibers of a circle bundle over a closed surface (and thus taut). Schweitzer's construction plays a key role in her proof as well as ours.

- The foliations of the paths we (including Larcanché) construct are malleable, but not taut in general. As a matter of fact, J. Bowden [Bo] and T. Vogel [Vo] recently gave examples of taut foliations homotopic as foliations but which cannot be connected by a path of *taut* foliations.

Now the proof of Theorem C goes as follows. Consider two malleable foliations, τ_0 and τ_1, homotopic as plane fields. Here, we only explain how to connect them by a path of malleable foliations. Think of τ_0 and τ_1 as obtained from two taut almost integrable plain fields ξ_0 and ξ_1 (by Thurston's construction, using Schweitzer's filling method; see "step 3" above, and Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5 for further detail) and take a path ξ_t, $t \in [0,1]$, of plane fields connecting ξ_0 and ξ_1. This is the path to which we are going to apply a parametric version of Thurston's process.

Step 1. We first deform the whole family ξ_t, $t \in [0,1]$, to a family of almost integrable plane fields (all having the same "holes", the poles varying continuously with respect to the parameter), keeping ξ_0 and ξ_1 unchanged (cf. Proposition 2.9). To do this, we pick a triangulation of M such that every ξ_t is almost constant on each 3-simplex. Unfortunately, since the direction of ξ_t varies with t, one cannot require the edges and faces to be transverse to *every* ξ_t. And if some ξ_t is tangent to some face σ at some point, one cannot find the desired nonsingular vector field ν_t near σ both tangent to ξ_t and transverse to σ. Fortunately, this problem has already been considered and solved by Eliashberg in the closely related field of contact structures [El]. The main idea is to consider these special 2-simplices σ as "big vertices" and treat them before any other simplex of the 2-skeleton. The adaptation of Eliashberg's techniques to foliations is carried out in the appendix.

Step 2. A parametric version of Thurston's second step (cf. Lemma 2.10) allows us to perturb the new family into a family of *taut* almost integrable plane fields (again keeping ξ_0 and ξ_1 unchanged).

Step 3. Each of these new plane fields can be made integrable following Thurston's third step, using (for each value of the parameter) transverse arcs connecting the poles of the balls (whose existence is guaranteed by step 2). This, in particular, turns ξ_0 and ξ_1 back into τ_0 and τ_1. But we want the resulting foliations to depend continuously on the parameter. This can be achieved if we find transverse arcs which vary continuously with respect to the parameter: then the toric holes to be filled also vary continuously, as well as the holonomy of the foliations induced on their boundaries, and Schweitzer's construction can be performed continuously too (cf. Theorem 1.7). In the general case however, the transverse arcs vary only *piecewise* continuously, and we only get a piecewise continuous path of foliations. To fill the gaps, we basically need to check that the deformation class

(among foliations) of a malleable foliation obtained from a taut almost integrable plane field does not depend on the choice of transverse arcs. This is the content of the Siphon Lemma 2.13, which is the final ingredient of Proposition 2.12 (the relative one-parameter version of Thurston's third step) and thus concludes the proof of Theorem C.

Reduction to the malleable case (Sections 3 and 4). To derive the injectivity of the map $\pi_0\mathcal{F}(M) \xrightarrow{\iota_*} \pi_0\mathcal{P}(M)$ from Theorem C, we need to show that any foliation can be deformed, among foliations, to a malleable one. Recall that a malleable foliation is basically one whose leaves all intersect closed transversals, except possibly finitely many torus leaves bounding Reeb components. What is true of *any* foliation now, according to classical results by S. P. Novikov [No] and S. Goodman [Go], is that only torus leaves can fail to intersect closed transversals. But such "problematic" torus leaves, which will henceforth be referred to as *Novikov leaves*, do not necessarily bound Reeb components. We want to get rid of them by deforming the foliation, or rather to replace them by nice ones lying in Schweitzer foliations. In Section 3, we first restrict to foliations which are described by a simple local model near their Novikov tori (cf. Definition 3.3). We call such foliations "*neat*". Local perturbations using the tools of Section 1 allow us to prove:

Theorem D (Malleabilization)**.** *Every neat foliation can be deformed to a malleable one among neat foliations.*

This, together with Theorem C, implies the following, where $\mathcal{N}(M)$ denotes the space of neat foliations on a manifold M:

Corollary D' (Neat case)**.** *Any continuous path of plane fields connecting two neat foliations can be deformed (with fixed endpoints) to a path of neat foliations. In particular, the map $\pi_0\mathcal{N}(M) \xrightarrow{\iota_*} \pi_0\mathcal{P}(M)$ induced by the inclusion $\mathcal{N}(M) \xhookrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{P}(M)$ is* injective.

Finally, in Section 4, we prove:

Theorem E. *Neat foliations are dense among foliations.*

This is precisely where we drop from *path*-connectedness to connectedness: instead of a *continuous deformation* of any foliation to a neat one, what we achieve is a(n arbitrarily) small *perturbation*.

Theorem A follows readily: given a connected component $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{P}(M)$, $\mathcal{F}(M) \cap \mathcal{C}$ is connected since $\mathcal{N}(M) \cap \mathcal{C}$ is both path-connected by Corollary D' and dense in $\mathcal{F}(M) \cap \mathcal{C}$ by Theorem E.

Acknowledgements. I am grateful beyond words to Emmanuel Giroux for his invaluable advice and support through all the stages of this work.

1 From plane fields to foliations on the solid torus

A key step in Thurston's construction of foliations (cf. "Step 3" in "Thurston's method" above) consists in deforming any given plane field ξ transverse to the $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor on the solid torus $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ to a foliation, relative to the boundary. Larcanché proved in [La] that this can actually be done continuously with respect to ξ, using a construction introduced by

Schweitzer in [Sc] as an alternative to Thurston's method. In this section, we give a brief account of these works.

Recall that, given a manifold M (possibly with boundary), $\mathcal{P}(M)$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}(M)$) denotes the space of plane fields (resp. foliations) on M. Now given a manifold B, we denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\pitchfork}(B \times \mathbb{S}^1)$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork}(B \times \mathbb{S}^1)$) the subspace of $\mathcal{P}(B \times \mathbb{S}^1)$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}(B \times \mathbb{S}^1)$) made up of plane fields transverse to the $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor.

Proposition 1.1. *There is a homotopy of maps $\psi_t : \mathcal{P}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1)$, $t \in [0,1]$, such that:*

- *ψ_0 is the inclusion,*
- *ψ_1 has value in $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1)$,*
- *for every ξ in $\mathcal{P}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1)$, all plane fields $\psi_t(\xi)$, $t \in [0,1]$, coincide along $\partial\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$.*

Remark 1.2. Since the disk is simply connected, the only foliation of $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ transverse to $\mathbb{S}^1$, up to fibered isotopy, is the foliation by meridian disks $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \{\cdot\}$. In other words, only the foliation of $\partial\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ by meridian circles extends to a foliation of $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ transverse to $\mathbb{S}^1$. Thus, most foliations in $\psi_1(\mathcal{P}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1))$ will not be everywhere transverse to $\mathbb{S}^1$.

The whole section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 1.1. The main issue is to construct the map ψ_1 which, to any plane field transverse to the $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor on $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, associates a foliation having the same trace on the boundary. Let us start with the simple yet key example of a plane field ξ defined by an equation of the form $dz - \rho(r)\lambda d\theta = 0$, where (r, θ) denote the polar coordinates on $\mathbb{D}^2$, z the coordinate on $\mathbb{S}^1$, λ some real number and ρ some smooth step function vanishing on $[0, 1/2]$ and equal to 1 near 1. This plane field induces a linear foliation on $\partial\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, which can be extended to a foliation of the solid torus by putting a Reeb component along the core curve and wrapping the external leaves around it as shown on Fig. 4.



Figure 4: Reeb filling of a linear foliation

Moreover, this foliation is homotopic to the initial plane field relative to the boundary. Lemma 1.3 below (applied to $\omega = dz - \lambda d\theta$), gives an analytic description of these objects. Let $\{\rho_0, \rho_{1/2}, \rho_1\}$ denote a partition of unity on $[0,1]$ meeting the following conditions:

- ρ_1 equals 1 near 1 and 0 precisely on $[0, 1/2]$;
- $\rho_{1/2}$ equals 1 near $1/2$ and 0 near $\{0, 1\}$;
- ρ_0 equals 1 near 0 and 0 precisely on $[1/2, 1]$.

Lemma 1.3 (Reeb Filling Lemma)**.** *For every non singular closed 1-form ω on $\partial\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, the 1-form*

$$\bar{\omega} = \rho_1(r)\,\omega + \rho_{1/2}(r)\,dr + \rho_0(r)\,dz$$

is nonsingular, integrable on $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ *and induces* ω *on the boundary. Moreover, if* $\omega(\partial_z) > 0$*, the* 1*-forms*

$$\bar{\omega}_t = \rho_1(r)\,\omega + \rho_{1/2}(r)\,(t\,dz + (1-t)\,dr) + \rho_0(r)\,dz, \quad t \in [0,1],$$

are all nonsingular, integrable if $\omega = dz$ *(but not in general) and define a homotopy of plane fields relative to the boundary between the plane field tangent to the foliation and a plane field transverse to the* $\mathbb{S}^1$ *factor.*

A foliation of the form $\bar{\omega}$ will be called a *Reeb filling of* ω, a *Reeb filling of slope* λ if $\omega = dz - \lambda d\theta$, or simply a *Reeb foliation.*

Remark 1.4. If $\omega = dz$, $t \in [0,1] \mapsto \bar{\omega}_{1-t}$ defines a deformation *of foliations* between the product foliation by meridian disks and a Reeb filling of slope 0 (cf. Figure 5: to visualize the deformation, rotate each picture of the central sequence around a vertical axis. This sequence represents a continuous path of dimension one foliations invariant under vertical translations, the continuous deformation of their tangent line fields being sketched above).



Figure 5: Addition of a Reeb component

Note that if ω is not closed, *i.e.* if the foliation on the boundary torus is not *linearizable*, $\bar{\omega}$ is not integrable. In fact, one can prove (cf. for example [C–C2, Lemma 2.1]) that Reeb's construction does not generalize to nonlinearizable foliations, due to some rigidity phenomenon concerning the *holonomy* of a C^2 foliation near a torus leaf (in relation with Kopell's Lemma [Ko] for commuting $\mathcal{C}^2$ diffeomorphisms of the interval). The idea is nevertheless to reduce to the linearizable case. To do so, one first needs to translate Proposition 1.1 in terms of *holonomy.*

Let τ be an element of $\mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1)$. The transversality condition implies that, for every x in $\mathbb{S}^1$, the leaf through $(1,x) \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ goes all the way around the torus, alternately intersecting every fiber $\{e^{2\pi i t}\} \times \mathbb{S}^1$, $t \in [0,1]$, at a point $(e^{2\pi i t}, f_t(x))$. This defines a one-parameter family $(f_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of smooth orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms of the circle, which has a unique lift $(\widetilde{f}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ to $\widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)}$ – the group of orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{R}$ commuting with the unit translation – satisfying $\widetilde{f}_0 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{R}}$. What we call *holonomy* of the foliation τ, and denote by $hol(\tau)$, is the diffeomorphism $\widetilde{f}_1$. For example, the holonomy of the foliation defined by $dz - \lambda d\theta = 0$ is the translation $T_{2\pi\lambda} : x \mapsto x + 2\pi\lambda$ (hence, we will sometimes call the corresponding Reeb filling: *Reeb filling of* $T_{2\pi\lambda}$). Now the following standard facts allow us to reduce Proposition 1.1 to Theorem 1.7 below:

Lemma 1.5. *The map*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1) & \to & \mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1) \\ \xi & \mapsto & \xi \mid_{\partial \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1} \end{array}$$

is a trivial fibration with contractible fibres. □

Lemma 1.6. *The holonomy map*

$$hol : \mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1) \to \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)}$$

is a trivial fibration with contractible fibers. □

Theorem 1.7 (Schweitzer [Sc], Larcanché [La])**.** *There is a homotopy of maps*

$$\varphi_t : \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1), \quad t \in [0,1],$$

such that:

- φ_0 *has value in* $\mathcal{P}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1)$,
- φ_1 *has value in* $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1)$,
- *for every* $f \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)}$, *all plane fields* $\varphi_t(f)$, $t \in [0,1]$, *coincide along* $\partial \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ *and* $hol(\varphi_t(f) \mid_{\partial \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1}) = f$.

The foliations $\varphi_f := \varphi_1(f)$, $f \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)}$, *will be referred to as* Schweitzer foliations.

Hence, in Proposition 1.1, the second point can be replaced by: "for every ξ in $\mathcal{P}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1)$, $\psi_1(\xi)$ is a Schweitzer foliation".

Let us now present the proof of Theorem 1.7. Again, the main issue is to construct the map φ_1 which, to any holonomy f, associates a foliation of $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ transverse to the boundary and whose restriction to the boundary has holonomy f. The idea is to reduce to the translation case (solved by Reeb's construction) by translating the following decomposition result of Herman for diffeomorphisms in terms of "foliation merging".

Theorem 1.8 (Herman [He2], p.123)**.** *Let* $\mu = (1+\sqrt{5})/2$ *denote the Golden Number. There is a continuous map*

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)} \to \mathbb{R} \times \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)} \\ f \mapsto (\lambda_f, g_f) \end{cases}$$

such that $f = T_{\lambda_f} \circ (g_f^{-1} \circ T_\mu \circ g_f)$ *for all* $f \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)}$, *and* $(\lambda_{\mathrm{id}}, g_{\mathrm{id}}) = (-\mu, \mathrm{id})$.

Remark 1.9.

- Schweitzer did not use or mention the continuous character of the map in [Sc], it is Larcanché who saw the potential of Herman's theorem for the parametric case.
- Actually, Herman proves this result for any number μ in a full-measure set, and works by Yoccoz show that it is true for any diophantine number μ. However, in what follows, we only need it to be true for one number μ.



Figure 6: Foliation merging

We can now describe Schweitzer's foliation φ_f for a given holonomy f. Roughly speaking, φ_f is obtained by taking the Reeb fillings of T_{λ_f} and $g_f^{-1} \circ T_\mu \circ g_f$, gluing them together as Fig. 6 suggests, and inflating the resulting picture a little to remove the angles. The holonomy on the boundary of the resulting bigger solid torus is exactly the composition of the holonomies on the smaller tori, *i.e* precisely f. A more rigorous argument is given below, using suspension foliations over a pair of pants (cf. Lemma 1.11).

Remark 1.10. Note that when f is the identity (i.e. when $\partial\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ is foliated by meridian circles), Schweitzer's foliation φ_{id} is not the foliation by meridian disks; it consists of two Reeb fillings (of T_μ and $T_{-\mu}$ respectively) "glued together". The "inflated" picture is depicted on Fig. 7. It will be important for us, however, to observe that φ_{id} and the foliation by meridian disks can be deformed to one another *through foliations*, relative to the boundary. Indeed, given the product foliation on $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, dig two parallel Reeb components in $D_\pm \times \mathbb{S}^1$ (cf. Remark 1.4), for some small disks $D_\pm \subset \mathbb{D}^2$. Then make the slope of the foliations induced on $\partial D_\pm \times \mathbb{S}^1$ vary from 0 to $\pm\mu/2\pi$ respectively. This deformation easilly extends to $(\mathbb{D}^2 \setminus (D_+ \cup D_-)) \times \mathbb{S}^1$ rel. $\partial\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ (cf. Lemma 1.11 below), and to $D_\pm \times \mathbb{S}^1$ using the Reeb Filling Lemma 1.3.

Similarly, the Reeb and Schweitzer foliations associated to a translation T_λ can be deformed to one another *through foliations*, relative to the boundary.



Figure 7: φ_{id}

In the general case, the resulting foliation φ_f is homotopic rel. boundary to a plane field transverse to the $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor (because Reeb fillings are), and as Larcanché observed, all of this can be done continuously with respect to f because the decomposition of f can and so does the "merging procedure". Let us clarify this last claim using Lemma 1.11 below, which reflects the flexibility of suspension foliations over a pair of pants, and will be used independantly on several occasions in Section 3.

To fix ideas, let $\mathbb{P}$ denote the (oriented) pair of pants obtained by removing from the unit disk $\mathbb{D}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ the interiors of the disks $D_\pm$ of radius $1/4$ centered at $\pm(1/2, 0)$. Let

$\partial_\pm\mathbb{P} = \partial D_\pm$ and $\partial_0\mathbb{P} = \partial\mathbb{D}^2$ (oriented as the boundary of $D_\pm$ and $\mathbb{D}^2$ respectively). Let $V \subset \mathbb{P}$ be the union of two segments joining $(0,-1) \in \partial\mathbb{D}^2$ to $\pm(1/4,0) \subset \partial_\pm\mathbb{P}$ respectively, and $\mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork,V}(\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1)$ the subspace of $\mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork}(\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1)$ made of foliations inducing the horizontal foliation by $V\times\{\cdot\}$ on $V\times\mathbb{S}^1$. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_0$ the group of fibered diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1$



Figure 8: Boundary components of $\mathbb{P}$

above the identity inducing the identity on $(V\cup\partial_\pm\mathbb{P})\times\mathbb{S}^1$. The group $\mathcal{G}_0$ is contractible and acts on $\mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork,V}(\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1)$. Using $V\cap\partial_i\mathbb{P}$ as a base point on $\partial_i\mathbb{P}$, $i\in\{+,-,0\}$, we get holonomy maps $h_i : \mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork,V}(\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1) \to \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+}(\mathbb{S}^1)$, $h_i(\tau) = hol(\partial_i\tau)$, where $\partial_i\tau$ denotes the foliations induced by τ on $\partial_i\mathbb{P}$, which satisfy $h_0(\tau) = h_-(\tau)\circ h_+(\tau)$.

Lemma 1.11. *The restriction map*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork,V}(\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1) \to \mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork}(\partial_-\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1)\times\mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork}(\partial_+\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1) \\ \qquad\qquad \tau \mapsto (\partial_-\tau, \partial_+\tau) \end{cases}$$

is a trivial fibration with contractible fibers (the orbits of $\mathcal{G}_0$). □

Let us now rephrase the proof of Proposition 1.7] in terms of Lemma 1.11. Let $f \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+}(\mathbb{S}^1)$. Define on $\mathbb{S}^1\times\mathbb{S}^1$ two closed forms $\omega_+ = g_f'(z)dz - \mu d\theta$ and $\omega_- = dz - \lambda_f d\theta$ (cf. Theorem 1.8), which define foliations of holonomy $g_f^{-1}\circ T_\mu \circ g_f$ and T_{λ_f} respectively. According to Lemma 1.11, there exists a foliation of $\mathcal{F}_{\pitchfork,V}(\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1)$ whose restrictions $\partial_\pm\tau$ to $\partial_\pm\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1$ are the foliations defined by $\omega_\pm$ and whose restriction $\partial_0\tau$ to $\partial_0\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{S}^1$ has holonomy $f = T_{\lambda_f}\circ(g_f^{-1}\circ T_\mu\circ g_f)$. Then apply the Reeb filling Lemma 1.3 to the forms $\omega_\pm$ to define $\varphi_t(f)$ in $D_\pm\times\mathbb{S}^1$. Everything can be done continuously with respect to f.□

2 Flexibility of malleable foliations

In this section, we give a proper definition of almost integrable plane fields and malleable foliations, and prove Theorem C, that is that any path of plane fields connecting two malleable foliations can be deformed with fixed endpoints to a path of malleable foliations. This follows from Proposition 2.9, Lemma 2.10 and Proposition 2.12, which can be seen as one-parameter versions of Thurston's first, second and third steps in [Th2] (cf. introduction).

From now on, given a 3-manifold M, by a *bunch of balls* (resp. *solid tori, arcs...*) in $\mathrm{Int}(M)$, we mean a finite union of disjoint such things.

2.1 Almost-integrable plane fields and malleable foliations

Definition 2.1. Let M be a 3-manifold (possibly with boundary) and $B = \bigcup_i B_i \subset \mathrm{Int}(M)$ a bunch of balls. A plane field ξ on M is *almost horizontal on* B if it is integrable near ∂B and satisfies the following conditions for some parametrization (called *adapted*) of each ball B_i by $\mathbb{D}^3$:

- ξ is tangent to $S_i = \partial B_i = \partial \mathbb{D}^3$ exactly at the poles;
- for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a nonsingular vector field ν on $B_i = \mathbb{D}^3$ everywhere positively transverse to ξ and to the horizontal plane field $dz = 0$ and tangent to S_i outside the ε-neighbourhood of the poles.

A plane field ξ on M is *B-almost integrable* if it is integrable on $M \setminus \mathrm{Int}\, B$ and almost horizontal on B. A B-almost integrable plane field ξ on M is *taut* if the induced foliation on $M \setminus \mathrm{Int}\, B$ is taut (meaning that every transverse arc in $M \setminus \mathrm{Int}\, B$ extends to a closed transversal in $M \setminus \mathrm{Int}\, B$). Finally, a plane field ξ is *almost integrable* if it is B-almost integrable for some B.

Definition 2.2. A Schweitzer foliation of the solid torus is *simple* if its holonomy on the boundary torus has whole intervals of fixed points, that is if the induced foliation on $\partial \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ has a one-parameter family of closed leaves bounding meridian disks.

Definition 2.3. Let M be a 3-manifold. A codimension-one foliation τ on M is *malleable* if there is a bunch of solid tori $W = \bigcup_i W_i \subset \mathrm{Int}(M)$ such that:

- τ induces a simple Schweitzer foliation on each W_i,
- τ induces a taut foliation on $M \setminus \mathrm{Int}\, W$.

In particular, taut foliations are malleable. Recall that on a *closed* 3-manifold, only torus leaves can fail to meet a closed transversal, and that we referred to such problematic leaves as *Novikov tori* of the foliation. Thus, a foliation on a *closed* 3-manifold is malleable if all its Novikov tori are torus leaves of (simple) Schweitzer foliations.

There is a natural correspondence between malleable foliations on the one hand and, on the other hand, taut almost integrable plane fields together with an additional piece of data, namely, for each ball of the associated bunch B, a transverse arc connecting the poles in $M \setminus \mathrm{Int}\, B$ (cf. Fig. 3):

Lemma 2.4. *Let M be a 3-manifold, $B = \bigcup_1^n B_i \subset \mathrm{Int}(M)$ a bunch of balls, ξ a taut B-almost integrable plane field on M and $\{A_i\}_{1 \le i \le n}$ disjoint transverse arcs to ξ, each A_i connecting the poles of B_i in $M \setminus \mathrm{Int}\, B$. Then there is a malleable foliation τ on M with the following properties:*

- *the solid tori W_i associated to τ are neighbourhoods of $B_i \cup A_i$, $1 \le i \le n$;*
- *the plane fields ξ and τ are homotopic relative to $M \setminus \bigcup_i \mathrm{Int}\, W_i$.*

Conversely:

Lemma 2.5. *Let M be a 3-manifold, τ a malleable foliation on M and $W = \bigcup_1^n W_i$ the corresponding bunch of solid tori. There exists a plane field ξ, together with balls $B_i \subset W_i$ and arcs $A_i \subset \mathrm{Int}\, W_i \setminus \mathrm{Int}\, B_i$ such that:*

- *ξ is taut B-almost integrable, where $B = \bigcup_i B_i$;*
- *each arc A_i is transverse to ξ and connects the poles of B_i ;*
- *the plane fields τ and ξ are homotopic relative to $M \setminus \operatorname{Int} W$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.4. This follows readily from Theorem 1.7. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, we can parametrize a neighbourhood W_i of $B_i \cup A_i$ by $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, so that:

- $A_i = \{0\} \times J_i$ for some interval J_i of $\mathbb{S}^1$ and ξ is tangent to the disks $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \{\cdot\}$ on $\mathbb{D}^2 \times J_i$;
- ξ is transverse to the $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor, and integrable in a neighbourhood of ∂W_i.

Let $f_i \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ be the holonomy of the foliation induced by ξ on ∂W_i. According to Theorem 1.7, the tangent plane field to the (simple) Schweitzer foliation φ_{f_i} is homotopic to ξ relative to ∂W_i. Let τ be the foliation of M which coincides with ξ on $M' = M \setminus \bigcup \operatorname{Int} W_i$ and with φ_{f_i} on W_i. It remains to prove that $\tau \mid_{M'} = \xi \mid_{M'}$ is taut. Let L' be a leaf of $\tau \mid_{M'}$, and L the leaf of $\xi \mid_{M \setminus \operatorname{Int} B}$ such that $L' = L \cap M$. By assumption on ξ, L is crossed by a closed transversal Γ to $\xi \mid_{M \setminus \operatorname{Int} B}$, and we can assume that Γ meets L at some point of L'. Now it is not difficult to push Γ out of $W \setminus B$. □

Remark 2.6. According to Proposition 1.1, the above construction can actually be performed continuously on *families* of taut almost integrable plane fields given with transverse arcs provided these transverse arcs vary continuously. Proposition 2.12 below will show how to get rid of the latter condition.

Proof of Lemma 2.5. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ and for some suitable parametrization of W_i by $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, the Schweitzer foliation $\tau \mid_{W_i}$ is homotopic relative to the boundary to a plane field $\bar{\xi}$ transverse to the $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor and whose restriction to $\partial W_i = \partial \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ is tangent to $\partial \mathbb{D}^2 \times \{z\}$ for all z in some interval J_i of $\mathbb{S}^1$. We can thus deform $\bar{\xi}$ relative to the boundary among plane fields transverse to $\mathbb{S}^1$ into a plane field ξ tangent to the disks $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \{\cdot\}$ on $\mathbb{D}^2 \times J_i$. We then define B_i as the ball obtained after rounding the box $W_i \setminus (\mathbb{D}^2 \times J_i) = \mathbb{D}^2 \times (\mathbb{S}^1 \setminus J_i)$, making sure that ∂B_i has exactly two tangency points with ξ: the poles, located on the core curve $\{0\} \times \mathbb{S}^1$ of W_i. If we parametrize B_i by $\mathbb{D}^3$ in such a way that the third coordinate coincides with the coordinate z in $\mathbb{S}^1$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, the vector field ∂_z on $\mathbb{D}^2 \times (\mathbb{S}^1 \setminus J_i)$ can easilly be extended into a vector field ν satisfying all the properties of Definition 2.1. The sub-arc A_i of $\{0\} \times J_i$ connecting the poles of B_i is transverse to ξ. □

2.2 Flexibility of taut almost integrable plane fields

Here we prove:

Proposition 2.7. *Let ξ_0 and ξ_1 be taut B-almost integrable plane fields on a closed 3-manifold M, for some bunch of balls $B \subset M$. Any path $(\xi_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ of plane fields on M connecting ξ_0 to ξ_1 is homotopic with fixed endpoints to a path of taut $\widehat{B}$-almost integrable plane fields, where $\widehat{B}$ is a bunch of balls including B.*

Here, we say that a bunch of balls $\widehat{B} = \bigcup_1^m \widehat{B}_j$ *includes* a bunch of balls $B = \bigcup_1^n B_i$ if $\{B_i\}_i$ is a subset of $\{\widehat{B}_j\}_j$. Proposition 2.7 follows readily from the next three results, in which the notation $\mathrm{Op}(A)$, for a subspace A of any topological space, refers to a small nonspecified open neighbourhood of A. Lemma 2.8 and Proposition 2.9 provide a relative one-parameter version of Thuston's "step 1" (cf. introduction) while Lemma 2.10 corresponds to "step 2" and is applied to the restriction to $N = M \setminus \mathrm{Int}\,\overline{B}$ of the path provided by Proposition 2.9.

Lemma 2.8. *Let ξ_0 and ξ_1 be B-almost horizontal plane fields on a closed 3-manifold M, for some bunch of balls $B \subset M$. Any path $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of plane fields on M connecting ξ_0 to ξ_1 is homotopic with fixed end points to a path of B-almost horizontal plane fields.*

Proposition 2.9. *Let ξ_0 and ξ_1 be B-almost integrable plane fields on a closed 3-manifold M, for some bunch of balls $B \subset M$. Any path $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of B-almost horizontal plane fields on M connecting ξ_0 to ξ_1 is homotopic with fixed end points and rel. $\mathrm{Op}(B)$ to a path of $\overline{B}$-almost integrable plane fields, where $\overline{B}$ is a bunch of balls including B.*

Lemma 2.10. *Let ξ_0 and ξ_1 be taut foliations on a compact 3-manifold N (possibly with boundary), and $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ a path of foliations on N connecting ξ_0 to ξ_1 and having no component of ∂N as a leaf. Then $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ is homotopic with fixed end points and rel. $\mathrm{Op}(\partial N)$ to a path $(\bar{\xi}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of* taut *B'-almost integrable plane fields, for some bunch of balls $B' \subset \mathrm{Int}(N)$.*

Lemmas 2.8 and 2.10 are proved below. Proposition 2.9 will be discussed in the appendix. Actually this result is a version for foliations of a theorem established by Eliashberg for contact structures (see [El, Lemma 3.2.1]). Though the key ideas of the proof are purely geometrical, their implementation requires some tedious technical estimates which will be carried out in full detail.

The first step of the proof of Lemma 2.8 consists in reducing to the case where ξ_0 and ξ_1 coincide on B and are *horizontal* on each ball of B in some adapted coordinates:

Claim 2.11. Let M be a closed 3-manifold, ξ a plane field on M almost horizontal on some ball $B \subset M$, and (x, y, z) the coordinates induced on B by some adapted parametrization. Then ξ can be deformed relative to $M \setminus \mathrm{Op}(B)$ among B-almost horizontal plane fields to a plane field defined by $dz = 0$ on B.

Proof of Claim 2.11. We want to straighten out ξ in B while keeping it fixed outside $\mathrm{Op}(B)$. The difficulty is to do this *through B-almost horizontal plane fields.*

Let α be an equation of ξ which, near each pole of B, coincides with the differential of some function f. Define ξ_t, $t \in [0, 1]$, as the kernel of the form

$$\alpha_t = (1 - \rho)\alpha + \rho\,((1 - t)\alpha + t\,dz)\,,$$

where $\rho\colon M \to [0, 1]$ is a smooth function equal to 1 near B and with compact support in a neighbourhood U of B, small enough that all the forms $(1 - t)\alpha + t\,dz$ are nonsingular on U.

Clearly, $\xi_0 = \xi$, all the plane fields ξ_t coincide with ξ outside U, and $\xi_1 \,|\, _B$ is defined by $dz = 0$. Moreover, all the plane fields ξ_t are integrable near the poles of B for α_t equals $(1 - t)\,df + t\,dz$ there.

Let us now show that ξ_t is tangent to ∂B exactly at the poles $p_\pm$. Let $p \in \partial B \backslash \{p_\pm\}$ and $\varepsilon < \mathrm{dist}(p, \{p_\pm\})$. According to Definition 2.1, there exists a vector field ν on B positively transverse to ξ and to the z-levels and tangent to ∂B outside the ε-neighbourhood of the poles. By construction, $\alpha_t(\nu) > 0$, and since ν is tangent to ∂B at p, no plane field ξ_t is tangent to ∂B at p. Incidentally, we see that the vector field ν is positively transverse to both ξ_t and the z-levels.

We finally need to perform a $\mathcal{C}^0$-small perturbation of the ξ_t's so that they become integrable near ∂B, and hence almost horizontal on B. Fix ε small enough that the plane fields ξ_t are integrable in a 2ε-neighbourhood of the poles, denote by ν the associated vector field and extend it to a vector field transverse to the ξ_t's in a neighbourhood of B. Let S be the surface obtained from ∂B by removing an ε-neighbourhood of the poles. We can parametrize a collar neighbourhood $W = S \times \mathbb{D}^1$ of S by $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{D}^1 \times \mathbb{D}^1$ so that $S = \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{D}^1 \times \{0\}$ and that every curve $\{\cdot\} \times \mathbb{D}^1 \times \{\cdot\}$ is an orbit segment of ν. Since ν is transverse to ξ_t, there exists a unique vector field η_t on W tangent to ξ_t and to each rectangle $\{\cdot\} \times \mathbb{D}^1 \times \mathbb{D}^1$ and whose last component is 1. Now define $\bar{\xi}_t$ to be a $\mathcal{C}^0$-small perturbation of ξ_t with the following properties (see the appendix for similar constructions):

- $\bar{\xi}_t$ coincides with ξ_t along S and outside $S \times (-\delta, \delta) \subset W$ with δ arbitrarilly small;
- $\bar{\xi}_t$ contains η_t at every point of W ;
- $\bar{\xi}_t$ is invariant under η_t near S and thus integrable there.

Note that on every region of the type $S' \times (-\delta', \delta') \subset S \times \mathbb{D}^1$ where ξ_t is integrable, $\bar{\xi}_t$ is equal to ξ_t. This shows in particular that $\bar{\xi}_i = \xi_i$ for $i = 0, 1$ and that $\bar{\xi}_t = \xi_t$ near $\partial S \times \mathbb{D}^1$ for all t. □

Proof of Lemma 2.8. It is enough to consider the case where B consists of a unique ball. Let $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ be a path of plane fields from ξ_0 to ξ_1. Using Claim 2.11, we assume that, in some adapted parametrization $\psi_i : \mathbb{D}^3 \to B$, the equation of ξ_i, $i = 0, 1$, is $dz = 0$. Since the group of diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{D}^3$ is connected (according to a theorem of J. Cerf [Ce]), there exists an isotopy of B between id and $\psi_1 \circ \psi_0^{-1}$. Deforming ξ_0 by an extension of this isotopy to M (among plane fields which are obviously almost horizontal on B), we reduce to the case where ξ_0 coincides with ξ_1 on B and $\psi_0 = \psi_1 = \psi$.

One can reparametrize the path $(\xi_t)_t$ so that ξ_t coincides with ξ_0 for $t \in [0, 1/3]$ and with ξ_1 for $t \in [2/3, 1]$, and deform it slightly near $\psi(0)$, keeping ξ_0 and ξ_1 unchanged, so that each $\psi^*\xi_t$ is constant on the euclidean ball of radius ε centered at 0.

We then define the following family of balls:

- B_t is the image under ψ of the euclidean ball centered at 0 and of radius $3(\varepsilon-1)t+1$ for $t \in [0, 1/3]$;
- $B_t = B_{1/3}$ for all $t \in [1/3, 2/3]$;
- $B_t = B_{1-t}$ for $t \in [2/3, 1]$.

By construction, ξ_t is almost horizontal on B_t for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Let ϕ_t be an isotoy supported in a neighbourhood of B satisfying $\phi_0 = \phi_1 = \mathrm{id}$ and $\phi_t(B) = B_t$ for all t. Then $(\phi_t^*\xi_t)$ is a path of B-almost horizontal plane fields homotopic to $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ with fixed end points. □

Proof of Lemma 2.10. For every $t \in [0,1]$, we can find finitely many disjoint arcs in $\operatorname{Int} N$ transverse to ξ_t and whose union meets every leaf of ξ_t. Extending them slightly if necessary, we can assume they have the same property with respect to ξ_s for all s close enough to t. Hence we can find a subdivision $0 = t_0 < ... < t_m = 1$ of $[0,1]$ such that, for every $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, there exists a bunch of arcs in $\operatorname{Int} N$ which is transverse to ξ_t and meets every leaf of ξ_t for all $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$.

For simplicity, let us assume $m = 1$, so that we have a unique collection of transverse arcs. The general case is analogous. Let A be one of the arcs. We can assume that every ξ_t is tangent to $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \{\cdot\}$ in a neighbourhood $C = \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{D}^1$ of A, where $A = \{0\} \times [-1/2, 1/2]$. Let D_+ and D_- be two small disks in $\mathbb{D}^2$ and $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{D}^2 \setminus \operatorname{Int}(D_+ \cup D_-)$. Let us first describe



Figure 9: ξ_t^0

the deformation of $(\xi_t)_t$ on $\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{D}^1 \subset C$. Let f_u, $u \in [0,1]$, be a path of diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{D}^1$ coinciding with the identity near the boundary, such that $f_0 = \mathrm{id}$ and $f_u(x) > x$ for all $x \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ and all $u > 0$. Using an analogue of Lemma 1.11, we construct a deformation $u \in [0,1] \mapsto (\xi_t^u \mid_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{D}^1})_{t\in[0,1]}$ such that:

- $\xi_t^0 \mid_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{D}^1} = \xi_t \mid_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{D}^1}$ for all $t \in [0,1]$;
- $\xi_i^u \mid_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{D}^1} = \xi_i \mid_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{D}^1}$ for all $u \in [0,1]$, $i = 0, 1$;
- for every $(t,u) \in [0,1]^2$, the foliation $\xi_t^u \mid_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{D}^1}$ is transverse to the $\mathbb{D}^1$ factor, coincides with ξ_t near $\partial(\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{D}^1) \cap \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{D}^1$, and induces on $\partial D_+ \times \mathbb{D}^1$, $\partial D_- \times \mathbb{D}^1$ and $\partial \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{D}^1$ foliations of holonomy $f_{\rho(t)u}$, $f_{\rho(t)u}^{-1}$ and id respectively, where $\rho\colon [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}_+$ denotes a smooth function vanishing only at 0 and 1.



Figure 10: ξ_t^1

One easilly extends each $\xi_t^u \mid_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{D}^1}$ (continuously with respect to $(u,t) \in [0,1]^2$), to a *plane field* on $C = \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{D}^1$ in such a way that $\xi_t^0 = \xi_t$ for all $t \in [0,1]$ and, for $i = 0, 1$, $\xi_i^u = \xi_i$ for all $u \in [0,1]$. But for $(t,u) \notin [0,1] \times \{0\} \cup \{0,1\} \times [0,1]$, ξ_t^u cannot be integrable on

$D_\pm \times \mathbb{D}^1$ for we have made its holonomy nontrivial on the lateral boundary. Denote by $B_\pm$ a ball obtained by rounding the corners of $D_\pm \times \mathbb{D}^1$.

Let $(\bar{\xi})_{t\in[0,1]}$ denote the path of plane fields on N obtained by carrying out the above perturbation $u \mapsto (\xi_t^u)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in a neighbourhood of every transverse arc A, and B' the collection of balls $B_\pm$. Then for every $t \in [0,1]$, $\bar{\xi}_t$ is integrable on $N \setminus \operatorname{Int} B'$ and almost horizontal on B'. The foliations $\bar{\xi}_0 = \xi_0$ and $\bar{\xi}_1 = \xi_1$ are taut by assumption. For every $t \in (0,1)$, every leaf of the foliation defined by $\bar{\xi}_t$ on $N \setminus \operatorname{Int} B'$ meets the boundary of some ball $B_\pm$ in the "subtropical" region where the induced foliation spirals up or down (from $\mp 1/2$ to $\pm 1/2 \in \mathbb{D}^1$). In particular, it is noncompact and meets a closed transversal: the "equator" of $\partial B_\pm$. □



Figure 11: B_- and its equator

2.3 Deforming families of taut almost integrable plane fields

Proposition 2.12. *Let M be a closed 3-manifold and $B \subset M$ a bunch of balls. Every path $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of taut B-almost integrable plane fields on M can be deformed to a path $(\tilde{\xi}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of malleable foliations. Furthermore, if τ_0 and τ_1 are malleable foliations obtained from ξ_0 and ξ_1 by Lemma 2.4, the deformation from ξ_i to $\tilde{\xi}_i$, for $i = 0, 1$, can be required to coincide with the corresponding deformation from ξ_i to τ_i.*

This will follow from the study of two particular cases: the one, settled in Remark 2.6, where one is given families of transverse arcs connecting the poles of the balls and varying continuously with the parameter, and the one where ξ_t does not depend on t, which can be rephrased as follows:

Lemma 2.13 (Siphon Lemma)**.** *Let M be a closed 3-manifold, $B = \bigcup_1^n B_i \subset M$ a bunch of balls, ξ a taut B-almost integrable plane field on M and $A^\pm = \bigcup A_i^\pm \subset M \setminus \operatorname{Int} B$ two bunches of transverse arcs to ξ, each $A_i^\pm$ connecting the poles of B_i. The malleable foliations $\tau^\pm$ built from ξ and $A^\pm$ can be connected by a path of malleable foliations. What's more, the loop of plane fields formed by the homotopies from ξ to τ^-, τ^- to τ^+, and τ^+ to ξ bounds a disk of plane fields on M.*

Proof. Let us start with some setting up. For simplicity, let us assume $n = 1$, so that B is a single ball, and $A^\pm$ are two arcs transverse to ξ connecting the poles of B. Parametrize B minus two small polar caps by $\mathbb{D}^2 \times [-1/4, 1/4]$ in such a way that ξ is transverse to the second factor and tangent to $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \{\cdot\}$ in a neighbourhood of $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \{\pm 1/4\}$. Deform the arcs $A^\pm$ slightly into disjoint arcs $\bar{A}^\pm$ connecting $(\pm 1/2, 0, 1/4)$ to $(\pm 1/2, 0, -1/4) \in C = \mathbb{D}^2 \times [-1/4, 1/4]$ respectively, transversely to ξ in $\overline{M \setminus C}$. Let

$$D^\pm = \mathbb{D}^2 \cap \{\pm x \geq 0\},$$

where x denotes the first coordinate on $\mathbb{D}^2$,

$$C^\pm = C \cap \{\pm x \geq 0\} = D^\pm \times [-1/4, 1/4] \subset C$$

and let $W^\pm$ be solid tori obtained by smoothing the union of $C^\pm$ with a neighbourhood of $\bar{A}^\pm$ trivially foliated by ξ, such that

$$W^+ \cap W^- = C \cap \{x = 0\} = C^+ \cap C^-.$$

Parametrize $W^\pm$ by $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1 = \mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ so that

$$C^\pm = D^\pm \times [-1/4, 1/4] \subset D^\pm \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} = W^\pm.$$

Finally, denote by $g \in \mathrm{Diff}^\infty_+([-1/4, 1/4])$ the holonomy, for the base point $(0, -1) \in \partial\mathbb{D}^2$, of the foliation induced by ξ on the lateral boundary of C, $\bar{f}$ its extension by the identity into a diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{S}^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, and $f \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{S}^1)}$ the lift of $\bar{f}$ fixing $\pm 1/4$.

Now let C' be a slight shrinking of C so that ξ is integrable on $C \setminus C'$, and let $(\psi_t)_{t\in[-1,1]}$ be a continuous path of diffeomorphisms of M supported in $C = \mathbb{D}^2 \times [-1/4, 1/4]$, leaving the last coordinate unchanged and such that $\psi_0 = \mathrm{id}$ and $\psi_{\pm 1}(C') \subset C^\pm$. Define $\xi_t = (\psi_t)_* \xi$ for all $t \in [-1, 1]$, $\xi_t = \xi_{-1}$ for all $t \in [-2, -1]$ and $\xi_t = \xi_1$ for all $t \in [1, 2]$. In particular, $\xi_{\pm 1}$ induces a foliation by disks on $W^\mp$ and consequently a foliation of holonomy f on $\partial W^\pm = \partial D^\pm \times \mathbb{S}^1$ (the base point being $(0, -1) \in \partial D^\pm \subset \partial\mathbb{D}^2$). Let $\tau_{\pm 2}$ be a foliation of M coinciding with $\xi_{\pm 2}$ on $M \setminus W^\pm$ and with φ_f on $W^\pm$. This foliation is clearly isotopic to the foliation $\tau^\pm$ built from ξ and the transverse arc $A^\pm$ using the process of Lemma 2.4. Hence, to prove Lemma 2.13, it suffices to prove that $(\xi_t \,|\, _W)_{t\in[-2,2]}$, can be deformed (rel. boundary) to a continuous path of malleable foliations $(\tau_t \,|\, _W)$ connecting $\tau_{-2} \,|\, _W$ to $\tau_2 \,|\, _W$, the deformation from $\xi_{\pm 2}$ to $\tau_{\pm 2}$ being the one of Lemma 2.4 (outside W, one simply takes $\tau_t = \xi$). Let us just describe the path τ_t, $t \in [-2, 2]$, since the existence of the homotopy between (ξ_t) and (τ_t) is a direct consequence of Proposition 1.1 and its proof. The deformation τ_t, $t \in [-2, -1]$, consists in deforming the foliation by disks in W^+ to φ_{id} (cf. Remark 1.10). Now as t goes from -1 to 1, the holonomies of the foliations



Figure 12: The foliation τ_1 on W

induced by ξ_t on ∂W^- and ∂W^+ vary from f to id and from id to f respectively. Define $\tau_t \,|\, _{W^\pm}$, $t \in [-1, 1]$, to be the extensions of these foliations given by Proposition 1.7, so that τ_1 induces φ_f on W^+ and φ_{id} on W^-. Then τ_t, $t \in [1, 2]$, consists in deforming the foliation φ_{id} to a foliation by disks in W^-, which gives the desired malleable foliation τ_2. □

Proof of Proposition 2.12. Assume again, for simplicity, that B is a single ball. To each plane field ξ_t corresponds a particular parametrization of B by the unit euclidean ball $\mathbb{D}^3$. Denote by p_t and $q_t \in B$ the corresponding north and south poles. For every t, any arc on ∂B transverse to ξ_t joining the poles p_t and q_t can be extended in $M \setminus \operatorname{Int} B$ to a closed transversal, since the foliation defined by ξ_t on $M \setminus \operatorname{Int} B$ is taut. Hence, we get a family A_t of transverse arcs connecting the poles of B on the outside. To deal with the relative part of Proposition 2.12, assume A_0 and A_1 are prescribed, and denote by τ_0 and τ_1 the foliations obtained by applying Lemma 2.4 to ξ_0 and ξ_1. Now for all s close enough to some given t, A_t remains transverse to ξ_s, and we can slightly move its ends in a continuous way so that they coincide with p_s and q_s for all s. On every interval $[\frac{k}{m}, \frac{k+1}{m}]$, $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, with m sufficiently large, we thus have a continuous path $t \mapsto A_t(k)$ of transverse arcs (with $A_0(0) = A_0$ and $A_1(m-1) = A_1$). According to the parametric version of Lemma 2.4 (cf. Remark 2.6), we can deform $t \in [\frac{k}{m}, \frac{k+1}{m}] \mapsto \xi_t$ to a continuous path $t \in [\frac{k}{m}, \frac{k+1}{m}] \mapsto \tau_t(k)$ (with $\tau_0(0) = \tau_0$ and $\tau_1(m-1) = \tau_1$). Combining this with the Siphon Lemma 2.13 (applied to $\xi = \xi_{k/m}$, $A^- = A_{k/m}(k-1)$ and $A^+ = A_{k/m}(k)$), we get the desired homotopy from $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ to a path of malleable foliations joining τ_0 and τ_1. □

We can now conclude with the proof of Theorem C.

Proof of Theorem C. Let $(\tau_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ be a path of plane fields on a closed 3-manifold M connecting two malleable foliations τ_0 and τ_1, whose associated bunches of tori are denoted by W_0 and W_1. For $i = 0, 1$, Lemma 2.5 associates to τ_i and W_i a collection of balls B_i and a taut B_i-almost integrable plane field ξ_i homotopic to τ_i. We can assume that B_0 and B_1 have the same number of balls, completing one or the other if necessary with some small balls $\mathbb{D}^3$ on which ξ_i is horizontal. Deforming ξ_0 by an isotopy of M, we can then reduce to the case $B_0 = B_1 = B$. The deformation from ξ_0 to τ_0, the path $(\tau_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ and the deformation from τ_1 to ξ_1 form a path of plane fields connecting ξ_0 to ξ_1. According to Proposition 2.7, this path can be deformed with fixed endpoints to a path $(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$, of taut $\widehat{B}$-almost integrable plane fields, for some bunch of balls $\widehat{B} = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \widehat{B}_j$ including B. Now according to Proposition 2.12, this path can in turn be deformed to a path $(\tilde{\xi}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of malleable foliations. To complete the proof of Theorem C, it remains to see that, for $i = 0, 1$, the path consisting of the deformation from τ_i to ξ_i given by Lemma 2.5 followed by that from ξ_i to $\tilde{\xi}_i$ given by Lemma 2.4, can be deformed with fixed endpoints to a path of malleable foliations, which is a straightforward consequence of Proposition 1.1. □

3 Malleabilization of neat foliations

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem D, that is that every neat foliation can be connected to a malleable one by a path of neat foliations. We have not defined neat foliations yet, we have only said that they were described by a simple model near their Novikov tori. Let us now describe this model.

Definition 3.1. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we call any foliation on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ defined by an equation of the form:

$$\begin{cases} dz - u(z)(a^+ dx_1 + b^+ dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, \varepsilon] \\ dz - u(z)(a^- dx_1 + b^- dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [-\varepsilon, 0] \end{cases}$$

where $(a^{\pm}, b^{\pm}) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ and u is a smooth function vanishing only at 0, a *model foliation.*



Figure 13: Model foliation near a torus leaf, with $(a^-, b^-) = (0, 1)$ and $(a^+, b^+) = (4, 5)$

Remark 3.2. If u is not infinitely flat at 0 in the statement above, then $(a^+, b^+) = (a^-, b^-)$ since the equation is supposed to be $\mathcal{C}^\infty$. If u is infinitely flat at 0 however, the vectors (a^+, b^+) and (a^-, b^-) may differ.

Definition 3.3. Let τ be a smooth foliation on a closed 3-manifold. A torus leaf T of τ is *neat* if there is a parametrized neighbourhood $N \simeq \mathbb{T}^2 \times [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ of T on which τ induces a model foliation.

The foliation itself is *neat* if all its Novikov tori are neat.

Remark 3.4. A neat foliation has finitely many Novikov tori.

The definitions of *malleable* and *neat* extend in a natural way to foliations of a compact manifold transverse to the boundary. Theorem D is then a direct consequence of the following local deformation result:

Proposition 3.5. *Every model foliation on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1, 1]$ can be deformed to a malleable foliation through neat foliations and relative to the boundary.*

The proof consists of two steps: first we kill the initial torus leaf $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{0\}$, creating one or two new ones lying in Reeb foliations (cf. Lemma 3.6). This uses the form of the foliation near a neat leaf in a fundamental way. Then, we replace these Reeb foliations by a bunch of "parallel" simple Schweitzer foliations (cf. Lemma 3.7).

3.1 Rolling up a torus leaf

Lemma 3.6. *Every model foliation on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1, 1]$ can be deformed through neat foliations and relative to the boundary to a foliation taut outside one or two solid tori foliated by Reeb fillings.*

Proof. **Easy case**. There is a case in which getting rid of the toric leaf of a model foliation by a deformation of foliations *without adding any new toric leaf* is easy: this is when the equation of the foliation is of the form:

$$dz - u(z)(a dx_1 + b dx_2), \quad (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1, 1]$$

with $(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and u a smooth function vanishing only at 0 and having the same sign on both sides of 0. Then simply take a small deformation u_t, $t \in [0,1]$, of $u = u_0$ such that, for all $t > 0$, u_t is a smooth non-vanishing function coinciding with u outside a small neighbourhood of 0. Then the equations

$$dz - u_t(z)(adx_1 + bdx_2), \quad (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1,1]$$

define foliations τ_t which, for $t > 0$, have no torus leaf anymore.

The idea in the general case is to reduce to this easy case by changing the "slope" of the model foliation on one side of the central torus leaf, having beforehand inserted a Reeb filling to serve as a "siphon" for the excess (or lack) of slope.

Set up: choice of nice coordinates. Let τ be a model foliation on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1,1]$, defined by the equations:

$$\begin{cases} dz - u(z)(a^+dx_1 + b^+dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0,1] \\ dz - u(z)(a^-dx_1 + b^-dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1,0] \end{cases}$$

where $(a^\pm, b^\pm) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ and u is a smooth function vanishing only at 0. Up to a deformation of u near 0 (and thus of τ near $T = \mathbb{T}^2 \times \{0\}$), we can assume that this function is infinitely flat at 0. Furthermore, up to a linear change of coordinates on $\mathbb{T}^2$, we can assume that a^+ and a^- are different from 0. The function v equal to $|a^+u|$ on $[0,1]$ and $|a^-u|$ on $[-1,0]$ is smooth, so τ is actually described by an equation of the form $dz - v(z)(a^\pm dx_1 + b^\pm dx_2)$ with v smooth, positive, vanishing only at 0 and $a^\pm \in \{-1,1\}$. We distinguish two cases, depending on whether (a^+, b^+) differs or not from $-(a^-, b^-)$. The second case reduces to the first one by a continuous deformation of τ which consists in splitting the torus leaf $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{0\}$ into two, $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{\pm\varepsilon\}$, inserting a neat foliation of the form $dz - w(z)(a'dx_1 + b'dx_2)$ in the middle, with w smooth and vanishing only at $\pm\varepsilon$, and $(a', b') \neq \pm(a^+, b^+)$.

In the first case, there exists an integer vector of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ which forms a direct basis both with (a^+, b^+) and (a^-, b^-). In other words, up to a linear change of coordinates, we can assume $a^\pm > 0$. So replacing v by a^+v on $[0,1]$ and a^-v on $[-1,0]$, (which leaves v smooth and positive outside 0), we can assume that τ has an equation of the form:

$$\begin{cases} dz - v(z)(dx_1 + b^+dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0,1] \\ dz - v(z)(dx_1 + b^-dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1,0]. \end{cases}$$

Deformation on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1, 1/2]$. Recall we want to reduce to the "easy case" above, *i.e* to the case $b^+ = b^-$. So let us consider a continuous path b_t^+, $t \in [0,1]$, between $b_0^+ = b^+$ and $b_1^+ = b^-$. For later purposes, let us also require b_t^+ to be equal to b^+ for all $t \in [0, 1/2]$. Now on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1, 1/2]$, we consider the following path of foliations τ_t, $t \in [0,1]$:

$$\begin{cases} dz - v(z)(dx_1 + b^-dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1,0] \\ dz - v(z)(dx_1 + b_t^+dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, 1/2]. \end{cases}$$

For $t = 1$ we are in the situation of the "easy case" and the central (unique) torus leaf can be removed by a deformation of foliations relative to the boundary.

Deformation on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [1/2, 1]$. We now need to extend the above deformation to $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [1/2, 1]$ (relative to $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{1\}$).



Figure 14: Deformation on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [-1, 1/2]$

For $t \in [0, 1/2]$, the foliation induced on $\partial(\mathbb{T}^2 \times [1/2, 1])$ must remain unchanged. The foliation inside, however, is going to be modified by the insertion of a Reeb component along a transverse circle. More precisely, let p be a point in the open annulus $A = \mathbb{S}^1 \times (1/2, 1)$. The circle $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \{p\} \subset \mathbb{S}^1 \times A = \mathbb{T}^2 \times (1/2, 1)$ is transverse to the foliation, so for a small enough disk D centered at p in A, $\mathbb{S}^1 \times D$ is foliated by disks. According to Remark 1.4, there exists a deformation τ_t, $t \in [0, 1/2]$, of foliations on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [1/2, 1]$ relative to the complement of $\mathbb{S}^1 \times D$ such that $\tau_0 = \tau$ and $\tau_{1/2}$ induces a Reeb filling of slope 0 in $\mathbb{S}^1 \times D$.

Now we want to define a deformation τ_t, $t \in [1/2, 1]$, of foliations on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [1/2, 1]$ which induce linear foliations of equation $dx_1 + b^+ dx_2$ on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{1\}$ and $dx_1 + b_t^+ dx_2$ on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{1/2\}$ (with the right coorientation). To that end, consider the pair of pants $P = A \backslash D$. According to Lemma 1.11, we can define a path of foliations on $\mathbb{S}^1 \times P$ inducing the desired foliations on the boundary components of $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \partial A$, and inducing on $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \partial D$ a continuous path of linearizable foliations (*i.e* whose holonomies are (compositions of) translations), which can be extended inside $\mathbb{S}^1 \times D$ by a continuous path of Reeb fillings.



Figure 15: Deformation on $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [1/2, 1]$

The global foliation τ_1 is transverse to the first $\mathbb{S}^1$ factor outside $\mathbb{S}^1 \times D$, where it induces a Reeb filling, which concludes the proof. □

3.2 Holonomy fragmentation

Lemma 3.7. *A Reeb filling on $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ can be deformed to a malleable foliation through neat foliations and relative to the boundary.*

We already know that a Reeb filling can be deformed to a Schweitzer foliation rel. boundary (cf. Remark 1.10). But if the holonomy f on the boundary has no interval of

fixed points (*i.e* if it is not trivial, since it is a translation), this Schweitzer foliation is not *simple*. The idea is to replace it by a bunch of "parallel" simple Schweitzer foliations whose holonomies form a decomposition of f. This uses the following fragmentation lemma for diffeomorphisms, along with the flexibility of suspension foliations over a punctured disk just as Theorem 1.7 follows from Herman's decomposition theorem 1.8 together with the flexibility of suspension foliations over a pair of pants (Lemma 1.11).

Lemma 3.8. *Every element of* $\widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ *is the composition of finitely many elements of* $\widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+}(\mathbb{S}^1)$*, each having intervals of fixed points.*

Proof. Let $f \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+}(\mathbb{S}^1)$. If $|f(x) - x| < 1/2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a diffeomorphism $g \in \widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ which coincides with the identity near 0 and with f near $1/2$. Hence $f = g \circ (g^{-1} \circ f)$, where g and $g^{-1} \circ f$ each have an interval of fixed points.

In the general case, the function $v = f - \mathrm{id}$ is 1-periodic and satisfies $\max v - \min v < 1$. Thus $v = n\lambda + w$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $|w(x)| < 1/2$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda \in (-1/2, 1/2)$. Hence,

$$f = T_\lambda^n \circ (\mathrm{id} + w)$$

and each component of the righthandside falls into the first case. □

Proof of Lemma 3.7. Let τ be a Reeb filling of a translation T_λ and $f_1 \circ ... \circ f_n$ a decomposition of T_λ into diffeomorphisms each having intervals of fixed points (cf. Lemma 3.8). First of all, according to Remark 1.10, τ can be deformed among (neat) foliations and relative to the boundary into a Schweitzer foliation of the same slope. Now let D_1 be a disk in $\mathbb{D}^2$ big enough that the foliation on $(\mathbb{D}^2 \setminus D_1) \times \mathbb{S}^1$ is conjugate to the product foliation of the linear foliation on the boundary $\partial\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ by a small interval, and let D_2,...,D_n be small disks in $\mathbb{D}^2 \setminus D_1$ so that $D_i \times \mathbb{S}^1$ is foliated by disks for all $i \in \{2, ..., n\}$. Again according to Remark 1.10, these trivial foliations can be deformed to φ_{id} rel. $\partial D_i \times \mathbb{S}^1$. Denote by $\bar{\tau}$ the resulting foliation on $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$. Let f_2^t,...,f_n^t, $t \in [0, 1]$ be continuous paths in $\widetilde{\mathrm{Diff}_+}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ such that $f_i^0 = \mathrm{id}$ and $f_i^1 = f_i$ for all $i \in \{2, ..., n\}$, and let $f_1^t = T_\lambda \circ (f_2^t \circ ... \circ f_n^t)^{-1}$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Finally, let $P = \mathbb{D}^2 \setminus (D_1 \cup ... \cup D_n)$. According to (Lemma 1.6 and a straightforward generalization of) Lemma 1.11, there is a continuous path of foliations $\bar{\tau}_t$, $t \in [0, 1]$, on $P \times \mathbb{S}^1$, constant on $\partial\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ such that $\bar{\tau}_0 = \bar{\tau}\,|_{P \times \mathbb{S}^1}$ and the holonomy of $\bar{\tau}_t$ on $\partial D_i \times \mathbb{S}^1$ is f_i^t. Now according to Theorem 1.7, this can be extended to $\cup_i D_i \times \mathbb{S}^1$ by continuous paths of Schweitzer foliations, and the final foliation $\bar{\tau}_1$ of $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ is malleable. □

Remark 3.9. Let $\pi : M \to S$ be a circle bundle over a compact oriented surface, and consider the space of cooriented foliations on M positively transverse to the fibers except above a finite number of simple closed curves in the interior of S whose preimages by π are neat leaves. We show in [Ey], using the same kind of arguments as above, that this space is path-connected, and that this remains true if we fix the foliation on the boundary of M (if there is any). This extends the following result of Larcanché [La]: given a circle bundle $\pi : M \to S$ over a compact oriented surface S, the inclusion map from the space of foliations transverse to the fibres into the space of all foliations on M is homotopic to a constant.

4 Density of neat foliations

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem E, that is that any smooth foliation of a closed 3-manifold can be made *neat* (cf. Definition 3.3) by an arbitrarily small perturbation. The idea is very simple. A neat foliation is one which has only finitely many Novikov tori (*i.e.* torus leaves which meet no closed transversal) near which it is described by a simple explicit model (cf. Definition 3.1). A random foliation on the other hand can have infinitely many Novikov tori, but those are gathered in a finite number of disjoint saturated sets of the form $\mathbb{T}^2 \times [a, b]$, where the foliation is transverse to the second factor (cf. [Th1, Theorem 2], or for example [B–F]). We will refer to such regions as *Novikov stacks* of the foliation. What we have to do is perturb the foliation in a neighbourhood of these thickened tori (leaving it unchanged on the complement) into one with finitely many torus leaves each surrounded by a nice model foliation. To that aim, we first translate this requirement in terms of holonomy (cf. Section 4.1 below). Then, in Section 4.2, we use a result of C. Bonatti and A. Haefliger [B–H] to reduce our problem of approximation of foliations to an approximation result for holonomy representations proved in [B–E].

4.1 Neat foliations in terms of holonomy

Let S be a saturated set of the form $\mathbb{T}^2 \times J$, where J denotes a segment (possibly reduced to a point), of a foliated manifold (M, τ), on which τ is transverse to the second factor. Let Γ be a small extension of the parametrized transverse arc $t \in J \mapsto (0, 0, t) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times J \simeq S$ and let $\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, J)$ denote the group of germs of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ orientation preserving diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{R}$ defined in a neighbourhood of J. Then the holonomy of τ on the transverse arc Γ induces a homomorphism $h : \pi_1(\mathbb{T}^2, (0, 0)) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, J)$. Actually, since such a homomorphism is completely determined by the image of the standard basis of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, what we call *holonomy of τ on Γ* is simply the pair of commuting germs $(h(1, 0), h(0, 1))$. Let us now give a simple characterization of the neatness of a foliation in terms of holonomy.

Definition 4.1. A pair (f, g) of commuting elements of $\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, J)$ is called *neat* if f and g have finitely many common fixed points, and if for each such $z_0 \in \mathrm{Fix}(f) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(g)$, there is a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ vector field ν on $\mathbb{R}$ such that the left and right semi-germs of f and g at z_0 belong to the flow of the corresponding semi-germ of ν.

Remark 4.2. It follows directly from classical results of G. Szekeres [Sz], N. Kopell [Ko] and F. Takens [Ta] that if f and g are nowhere simultaneously infinitely tangent to the identity (or, in short, "*i.t.i*"), then (f, g) is neat.

Proposition 4.3. *The torus leaves of $\tau \mid_S$ are all neat if and only if the holonomy of τ on Γ is neat.*

Proof. Let (f, g) be the holonomy of τ on Γ. The torus leaves of $\tau \mid_S$ correspond to the common fixed points of f and g. Assume that (f, g) is neat. Let T be a torus leaf of $\tau \mid_S$ and $z_0 \in J$ the corresponding common fixed point of f and g. By definition of neat holonomy, there exists a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ vector field $\nu = u\partial_z$ on $\mathbb{R}$ vanishing only at z_0, and numbers a^+, a^-, b^+, b^- so that the semi-germs of f and g at $z_0^\pm$ coincide with the germs of the time-$a^\pm$ and $b^\pm$ maps of ν respectively. Now consider the foliation τ' on $M' = \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$

defined by the equations:

$$\begin{cases} dz - u(z)(a^+dx_1 + b^+dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [z_0, +\infty) \\ dz - u(z)(a^-dx_1 + b^-dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times (-\infty, z_0] \end{cases}$$

The holonomy of this foliation on the transverse arc $\Gamma' = \{(0,0)\} \times \mathbb{R}$ has the same germ at z_0 as the holonomy (f, g) of τ on Γ. Hence there is a diffeomorphism from a neighbourhood of $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \{0\}$ in M' to a neighbourhood of T in M carrying τ' to τ (see [C–C1, Theorem 2.3.9], for example, for a proof of this standard fact), which means precisely that T is a neat leaf of τ.

Now assume that all the torus leaves of $\tau \mid_S$ are neat. Let $z_0 \in J$ be a common fixed point of f and g and T the corresponding leaf of τ. Since T is neat, there is a parametrized neighbourhood $N \simeq \mathbb{T}^2 \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ of $T \simeq \mathbb{T}^2 \times \{0\}$ on which τ is defined by equations of the form:

$$\begin{cases} dz - u(z)(a^+dx_1 + b^+dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, \varepsilon) \\ dz - u(z)(a^-dx_1 + b^-dx_2), & (x_1, x_2, z) \in \mathbb{T}^2 \times (-\varepsilon, 0] \end{cases}$$

where $(a^\pm, b^\pm) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ and u is a smooth function vanishing only at 0. Hence, the germ at z_0 of the holonomy of τ on Γ is conjugate to the germ at 0 of the holonomy $(\bar{f}, \bar{g}) \in (\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, 0))^2$ of the above foliation on $\Gamma' = \{(0,0)\} \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$. But the semi-germs of $\bar{f}$ and $\bar{g}$ at $0^\pm$ are just those of the time-$a^\pm$ and $b^\pm$ maps of the smooth vector field $\nu = u\partial_z$. This shows that (f, g) is neat. □

4.2 Approximation result for foliations and holonomies

According to Proposition 4.3, what is left to prove is that for every Novikov stack S of a foliated manifold (M, τ) (coming with a transverse arc Γ), τ can be perturbed, relative to the complement of a neighbourhood of S, into a foliation also having S as a saturated set but whose holonomy on Γ is neat. According to the following result of [B–F] based on the main theorem of [B–H], this boils down to showing that any commuting pair $(f, g) \in \mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, J)^2$ can be approximated by neat pairs:

Proposition 4.4 (cf. [B–F], Proposition 1.b.1)**.** *Let (f, g) be the holonomy of τ on Γ and $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}$ two commuting local diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{R}$ defined near J, $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-close to f and g respectively, coinciding with them outside a small neighbourhood of J. Then there exists a foliation $\tilde{\tau}$ of M $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-close to τ which coincides with τ outside a small neighbourhood of S and whose holonomy on Γ is $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g})$.*

We thus need the following approximation result for commuting germs of diffeomorphisms:

Proposition 4.5. *Every commuting pair $(f, g) \in (\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, J))^2$ can be $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-approached by a neat pair $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g})$, coinciding with (f, g) outside a small neighbourhood of J.*

We will obtain this as a consequence of Theorem 4.7 below. Given an element f of $\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, J)$, we denote by $\mathrm{iti}(f)$ the set of points where f is infinitely tangent to the identity.

Definition 4.6 (cf. [B–E])**.** A pair (f, g) of commuting elements of $\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, J)$ is called *piecewise clean* if $I \setminus \mathrm{iti}(f) \cap \mathrm{iti}(g)$, for some small neighbourhood I of J, has finitely many connected components on the closure of which the restrictions of f and g either belong to a common (germ of) $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ flow or are iterates of the same (germ of) smooth diffeomorphism.

Theorem 4.7 (cf. [B–E])**.** *Any pair (f, g) of commuting elements of $\mathrm{Diff}_+(\mathbb{R}, J)$ can be $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ approached by a piecewise clean pair $(\bar{f},\bar{g})$, coinciding with (f, g) outside a small neighbourhood of J.*

Remark 4.8. Actually, what is proved in [B–E] (cf. Proposition 2.22) is an analogue of the above for diffeomorphisms of a segment, rather than germs of diffeomorphisms near a segment. But the argument for the germinal version is exactly the same.

Now the fact that any piecewiese clean pair $(\bar{f},\bar{g})$ can be approached by a neat pair is obtained by applying one of the following lemmas (or its germinal version) to the closure of each connected component of $I \setminus \mathrm{iti}(\bar{f}) \cap \mathrm{iti}(\bar{g})$ independently (the diffeomorphisms involved being infinitely tangent to the identity at the boundary). The diffeomorphisms of the resulting pair $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g})$ might still have whole intervals of common fixed points, but then it is easy to perturb $(\mathrm{id}, \mathrm{id}) \in (\mathrm{Diff}_+[a, b])^2$ slightly into a pair of commuting diffeomorphisms (twice the same for example) having only a and b as fixed points.

Lemma 4.9. *Every $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ map ν from $[0, 1]$ to $\mathbb{R}$ that is nowhere infinitely flat on $(0, 1)$ can be $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ approximated by a map with the same property, the same ∞-jet at the boundary and finitely many zeroes.*

Lemma 4.10. *Every $h \in \mathrm{Diff}_+[0, 1]$ that is nowhere infinitely tangent to the identity in $(0, 1)$ can be $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ approached by some $\tilde{h} \in \mathrm{Diff}_+[0, 1]$ of the same kind with finitely many fixed points, near each of which $\tilde{h}$ belongs to the flow of some $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ vector field.*

Proof of 4.9. If we forget about the ∞-jets at the boundary, this is just a standard transversality result. A little more care is needed if we want to preserve the jets. Actually, if ν is not infinitely flat at 0 nor 1, there is nothing to do. So let us consider the case where ν is infinitely flat at 0, say, and not at 1. What we are going to do is basically multiply ν by some smooth step function equal to 0 on some small neighbourhood $[0, t]$ of 0 (and to 1 away from there) and then spread the restriction to $[t, 1]$ of the resulting function to all of $[0, 1]$ (to get rid of the interval of zeros $[0, t]$).

More precisely, let ρ be a smooth map from $[0, +\infty)$ to $[0, 1]$ vanishing on $[0, 1]$, equal to 1 on $[2, +\infty)$ and increasing on $[1, 2]$, and consider, for all $t \in (0, 1]$, the map

$$\nu_t : x \in [0, 1] \mapsto \rho(\tfrac{x}{t})\nu(x).$$

Let us check that $t \in [0, 1] \mapsto \nu_t$, with $\nu_0 = \nu$, is continuous at 0 (in $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ topology). On $[2t, 1]$, $\left|\nu_t^{(n)}(x) - \nu^{(n)}(x)\right| = 0$. And on $[0, 2t]$,

$$\sup_{x\in[0,2t]} \left|\nu_t^{(n)}(x) - \nu^{(n)}(x)\right| = \sup_{x\in[0,2t]} \left|\sum_{k=0}^{n} \tbinom{n}{k} \tfrac{1}{t^{n-k}} \rho^{(n-k)}\left(\tfrac{x}{t}\right) \nu^{(k)}(x) - \nu^{(n)}(x)\right| = o(t)$$

for $\sup_{x\in[0,2t]} \left|\nu^{(k)}(x)\right| = o(t^l)$ for all l, ν being infinitely flat at 0. So $t \mapsto \nu_t$ is indeed continuous at 0. Now let $(h_t)_{t\in[0,1/2]}$ be a continuous family of increasing $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ maps on

$[0,1]$ satisfying $h_0 = \mathrm{id}$ and for all $t \in [0,1/2]$, $h_t(0) = t$ and $h_t = \mathrm{id}$ near 1. For t small enough, $\tilde{\nu} = \nu_t \circ h_t$ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-close to $\nu_0 \circ h_0 = \nu$. It is furthermore infinitely flat at 0, equal to ν near 1, and its zeros in $(0,1]$ are the preimages under h_t of those of $\nu \,|_{(t,1]}$, which are in finite number, and this concludes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 4.10. First apply Lemma 4.9 to $h_0 = h - \mathrm{id}$, denote by $\bar{h}_0$ the resulting map and define $\bar{h}$ as $\mathrm{id} + \bar{h}_0$, which satisfies all the requirements of Lemma 4.10 except maybe the last one. Actually, according to a result of Takens [Ta], $\bar{h}$ does belong to the flow of some $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ vector field near each *interior* fixed point because it is not *i.t.i* there. This however might not be true at 0 and 1, but this problem can be solved by some *local* perturbation as follows. Assume for example that $\bar{h}$ is *i.t.i* at 0, and denote by c the smallest fixed point of $\bar{h}$ different from 0. According to well-known results by Szekeres [Sz] and Kopell [Ko], $\bar{h}\,|_{[0,c)}$ belongs to the flow of a unique $\mathcal{C}^1$ vector field ν called the Szekeres vector field of $\bar{h}\,|_{[0,c)}$, and we may apply Proposition 2.15 in [B–E], that we restate below in our present simplified setting:

Proposition 4.11. *Let f be a smooth diffeomorphism of $[0,c)$,* i.t.i *at 0, without fixed points in $(0,c)$, and let ν be its Szekeres vector field.*

Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $a \in (0,c]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $x_0 \in (0,a]$ and a vector field on $[0,c)$ coinciding with ν on $[x_0,c)$, $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ on $[0,c)$, infinitely flat at 0, and ε-$\mathcal{C}^k$-small on $[0, \max(f^2(x_0), f^{-2}(x_0))]$.

Let $\tilde{\nu}$ be a vector field obtained by applying the above Proposition to $f = \bar{h}\,|_{[0,c)}$. The time-1 map $\tilde{f}$ of $\tilde{\nu}$ coincides with $\bar{h}\,|_{[0,c)}$ on $[f^{\pm 1}(x_0), c)$ and is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-close to id on $[0, f^{\pm 1}(x_0)]$, as is $\bar{h}$ if x_0 is small enough, so this indeed yields a $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-approximation of $\bar{h}$ by a diffeomorphism which belongs to a smooth flow near each of its fixed points. □

5 Appendix: Flexibility of almost integrable plane fields

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 2.9. We actually establish a more general statement, replacing the parameter space $[0,1]$ and its boundary $\{0,1\}$ by a compact finite dimensional polyhedron K and a closed subpolyhedron L of K (typically, $K = \mathbb{D}^n$ and $L = \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$). We will use the following vocabulary. A *K-plane field* ξ on a manifold M is a family ξ_t, $t \in K$, of plane fields on M. Now given a subset $X \subset K \times M$, we say that a K-plane field ξ is integrable on X if for every $t \in K$, the plane field ξ_t is integrable on $X_t = X \cap (\{t\} \times M)$. In practice, X is often of the form $(K \times A) \cup (L \times M)$, where A is a subset of M. We say that a K-plane field ξ is almost horizontal on a bunch of balls $B \subset M$ if, for every $t \in K$, the plane field ξ_t is almost horizontal on B. Finally, we say that a K-plane field ξ is $(K' \times B)$-almost integrable if for every $t \in K' \subset K$, the plane field ξ_t is B-almost integrable.

Recall that given a subset A of a topological space, the notation $\mathrm{Op}(A)$ refers to a small nonspecified open neighbourhood of A.

Proposition 5.1. *Consider a closed 3-manifold M, a bunch of balls B in M, a compact finite dimensional polyhedron K and a closed subpolyhedron L of K. Let ξ be an $(L \times B)$-almost integrable K-plane field on M, almost horizontal on B. There exists a K-plane field $\bar{\xi}$ on M with the following properties :*

1. *$\bar{\xi}$ is homotopic to ξ relative to $(K \times \mathrm{Op}\, B) \cup (L \times M)$;*

2. $\bar{\xi}$ is $(K \times \overline{B})$-almost integrable for some bunch of balls $\overline{B}$ including B.

In order to deform plane fields to integrable ones, Thurston initiated the use of triangulations. He demonstrated the effectivity of his idea in [Th1, Th2, Th3]. Eliashberg then adapted the techniques of [Th2] in [El] to deform plane fields to contact structures, and extended them to families of plane fields depending on any number of parameters. In return, Proposition 5.1 and its proof are modelled on part of [El], namely Lemma 3.2.1 and its proof, which relies on sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the same paper. Our aim here is to detail Eliashberg's arguments.

Let us now present the strategy of the proof of Proposition 5.1 and its main difficulties. The idea is to triangulate $M \setminus \operatorname{Int} B$ so finely that the oscillations of every ξ_t on each simplex are very small, and then to perturb ξ_t continuously till it becomes integrable near the 2-skeleton, *i.e.* outside a bunch of balls. This raises several problems:

– Make the plane fields ξ_t integrable in a neighbourhood of every simplex σ of the 2-skeleton. The strategy, following Thurston [Th2] and Eliashberg [El], is roughly the following. If there exists a nonsingular vector field ν_t near σ which is transverse to σ and tangent to ξ_t, one makes ξ_t invariant under ν_t leaving it unchanged along σ. If not, this means essentially that σ is 2-dimensional and that ξ_t is tangent to σ at some point p. One then takes a vector field ν_t tangent to ξ_t with a flowbox covering σ, and one handles σ as a « big vertex ». A key point is that those « special » simplices are disjoint.

– Ensure the almost horizontality of the resulting plane fields $\bar{\xi}_t$. One must control the size of the perturbation (in practice, $\mathcal{C}^1$ norms) so that the oscillations of every $\bar{\xi}_t$ on each 3-simplex σ remain very small. One then takes a ball B_σ inside σ whose boundary is so close to $\partial\sigma$ that it lies in the neighbourhood where every $\bar{\xi}_t$ is integrable. If this neighbourhood is sufficiently thick, the ball B_σ can be chosen convex enough that every $\bar{\xi}_t$ has only two contact points with the boundary sphere ∂B_σ.

To simplify the geometric estimates, we will proceed chart after chart, so as to work inside open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^3$.

5.1 Reduction to open sets of the euclidian space

The statement we will need in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is the following.

Lemma 5.2. *Let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^3$, F a closed subset of U and ξ a K-plane field on U integrable on $(K \times \operatorname{Op} F) \cup (L \times U)$. Given a compact subset $A \subset U$, there exists a K-plane field $\bar{\xi}$ on U satisfying the following properties:*

1. *$\bar{\xi}$ is homotopic to ξ relative to $(K \times (U \setminus G)) \cup (L \times U)$ where $G \subset U$ is a compact set disjoint from F containing the support of the deformation;*
2. *$\bar{\xi}$ is integrable on $K \times (A_* \setminus B)$ and almost horizontal on $K \times B$, where A_* is a compact neighbourhood of A and B a bunch of balls in $\operatorname{Int} A_* \setminus F$.*

Proof of Proposition 5.1 assuming Lemma 5.2. Let M, B and ξ be as in Proposition 5.1 and A_{0*} be a compact neighbourhood of B such that ξ is integrable on $K \times (A_{0*} \setminus B)$. Consider open charts $V_i \subset M$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, and compact subsets $W_i \subset V_i$ such that $M = \bigcup W_i$. Lemma 5.2 applied to

$$U_1 = V_1 \setminus B, \quad F_1 = U_1 \cap A_{0*}, \quad A_1 = W_1 \setminus \operatorname{Int} A_{0*}$$

and to the K-plane field ξ restricted to U_1, provides a compact set A_{1*}, a bunch of balls $B_1 \subset \operatorname{Int} A_{1*}$ and a new K-plane field ξ_1 on U_1, which extends to M by $\xi_1 = \xi$ on $M \setminus U_1$. We then apply Lemma 5.2 to

$$U_2 = V_2 \setminus (B \cup B_1), \quad F_2 = U_2 \cap (A_{0*} \cup A_{1*}), \quad A_2 = W_2 \setminus \operatorname{Int}(A_{0*} \cup A_{1*})$$

and to the K-plane field ξ_1 restricted to U_2, etc... □

5.2 Almost horizontality and curvature

The following lemma will be used to make sure that the plane fields we construct have the desired almost horizontality property. It corresponds to Lemmas 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 in [El].

Let ξ be a transversely oriented plane field on an open subset U of $\mathbb{R}^3$. For every $p \in U$, we denote by $\xi^+(p)$ the open half-space of $T_p\mathbb{R}^3$ lying on the positive side of $\xi(p)$ and by $\xi^\perp(p) \in \xi^+(p)$ the positive unit normal vector. In other words, $\xi^\perp \colon U \to \mathbb{S}^2$ is the Gauss map of ξ. For every integer $m \geq 1$, we write

$$\|\xi\|_m = \max_{0 \leq k \leq m} \sup_{p \in U} |(D^k \xi^\perp)(p)|.$$

Now given two points $p, q \in U$, the affine planes P_p and P_q tangent to $\xi(p)$ and $\xi(q)$ respectively, determin a pencil, namely the set of planes containing the straight line $P_p \cap P_q$, called the axis of the pencil. Note that this axis can be at infinity, in which case the planes of the pencil are all parallel.

Lemma 5.3. *Let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^3$, ξ a $\mathcal{C}^1$-bounded plane field on U and $S_* \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ a strictly convex sphere. For $d_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, every image $S \subset U$ of S_* by a dilation of factor $d \leq d_0$ has the following properties:*

1. *ξ is tangent to S at exactly two points, a north pole p_+ where their coorientations coincide and a south pole p_- where they are opposite; we denote by η the distribution of tangent planes to the pencil defined by ξ_{p_-} and ξ_{p_+} (the coorientation of ξ naturally endows η with a coorientation);*

2. *for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists, on the ball B bounded by S, a nonsingular vector field ν which lies in the dihedral cone $\Omega_p = \xi_p^+ \cap \eta_p^+$ at every $p \in B$, and which is tangent to S outside the ε-neighbourhood of the poles.*



Figure 16: 2-dimensional schematic picture

Proof. Let $c = \|\xi\|_1$ and let $k > 0$ be a (uniform) lower bound on the principal curvatures of S_* – so the principal curvatures of S are everywhere at least k/d.

Let $\gamma\colon S \to \mathbb{S}^2$ be the Gauss map of S. The curvature hypothesis means that γ is a diffeomorphism and that its inverse satisfies $|D\gamma^{-1}| \leq d/k$. Thus,

$$|D(\xi^\perp \circ \gamma^{-1})| \leq cd/k.$$

For all $d < k/c$, the maps $\pm\xi^\perp \circ \gamma^{-1}\colon \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2$ are contractions and each have a unique fixed point denoted by $\gamma(p_\pm)$. The points $p_\pm$ are the poles we are looking for. As for the vector field ν, it is easily obtained with a partition of unity, provided Ω_p (resp. $T_pS \cap \Omega_p$) is nonempty for every p in B (resp. in $S \setminus \{p_-, p_+\}$).

Let $p \in B$. Clearly, the angle between $\xi_p^\perp$ and $\eta_p^\perp$ satisfies

$$\angle(\xi_p^\perp, \eta_p^\perp) \leq \angle(\xi_p^\perp, \xi_{p_+}^\perp) + \angle(\xi_{p_+}^\perp, \xi_{p_-}^\perp) \leq 2\,\|\xi\|_1\, d\delta_*$$

where δ_* denotes the diameter of S_*. Thus, for $d < \pi/2c\delta_*$, the planes ξ_p and $-\eta_p$ are distinct, and hence Ω_p is nonempty.

Now let $p \in S \setminus \{p_-, p_+\}$. The plane T_pS is transverse to both ξ_p (by definition of $p_\pm$) and η_p (by convexity of S), and it is easy to see that $T_pS \cap \Omega_p$ is empty if and only if $\pm\gamma(p)$ belongs to the minimizing geodesic segment of $\mathbb{S}^2$ joining $\xi_p^\perp$ to $\eta_p^\perp$. Here we will discuss the case of $\gamma(p)$; for $-\gamma(p)$, replace p_+ by p_-.

Let ρ be the distance in B between p and p_+. On $\mathbb{S}^2$, the disk D of radius $c\rho$ centered at $\xi_{p_+}^\perp$ contains $\xi_p^\perp$ but not $\gamma(p)$ if $d < k/c$, for the principal curvatures of S are then greater than c. Moreover, since $d < \pi/2c\delta_*$, the disk D is geodesically convex: $c\rho \leq cd\delta_* < \pi/2$. To conclude, all we need to check is that if d is small enough, D contains $\eta_p^\perp$. This is done below, by showing that

$$\left\|\eta \mid_B\right\|_1 \leq \kappa c$$

for some constant κ given by the geometry of S_*.

First note that the norm of $D\eta^\perp$ at any point p is the inverse of the distance from p to the axis A of the pencil. Actually, in euclidian coordinates in which A is the z-axis, the map $\eta^\perp$ is of the form

$$(x, y, z) \longmapsto (x^2 + y^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(-y, x, 0),$$

so we can calculate the differential and its norm.

Now observe that the axis A remains distant from B. This is because B contains a euclidian (round) ball B' of radius dr_*, where r_* only depends on the geometry of S_*. The angle of the sector of the pencil between P_- and P_+ (the affine planes tangent to S at p_- and p_+) is bounded above by $cd\delta_*$. The fact that this sector contains B' implies that the distance l from the center of B' to A satisfies $dr_*/l \leq \sin(cd\delta_*/2)$. The desired estimate follows, provided d is sufficiently small. □

5.3 Triangulation and Key Lemma

The following result, which is the key to Lemma 5.2, is an adaptation of Lemma 2.3.4 in [El]. Before stating it, let us define the triangulation Δ of $\mathbb{R}^3$ it refers to.

The unit cube $[0, 1]^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ decomposes into six tetrahedra intersecting along the diagonal from $(0, 0, 0)$ to $(1, 1, 1)$. This subdivision of the cube gives rise to an infinite triangulation of $\mathbb{R}^3$ invariant under $\mathbb{Z}^3$, sometimes called *crystalline*, whose vertices are

the integer points. We then take the first barycentric subdivision of this triangulation and, as in Thurston's « Jiggling Lemma » [Th1], we « jiggle » it in a $(2\mathbb{Z}^3)$-periodic way so that any three edges sharing a vertex have linearly independant directions.

We denote by Δ the resulting triangulation and by $d\Delta$, for any $d > 0$, its image under a dilation of factor d. We also denote by $N_\varepsilon(V)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, the (closed) ε-neighbourhood of a subset V of $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Key Lemma 5.4. *Let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^3$, F a closed subset of U and ξ a K-plane field on U integrable on $(K \times \operatorname{Op} F) \cup (L \times U)$. Given a compact subset $A \subset U$, one can find positive numbers d_*, μ and c such that, for every $d < d_*$, there exists a K-plane field $\bar{\xi}$ on U with the following properties:*

1. *$\bar{\xi}$ is homotopic to ξ relative to $(K \times (U \setminus G_d)) \cup (L \times U)$ where G_d is a compact set disjoint from $N_d(F)$;*
2. *$\bar{\xi}$ is integrable on $K \times N_{\mu d}(A_d^2)$ where A_d is a compact polyhedral neighbourhood of A in $d\Delta$ and A_d^2 is the 2-skeleton of A_d;*
3. *$\left\| \bar{\xi}_t \mid_{N_{\mu d}(A_d)} \right\|_1 \leq c$ for all $t \in K$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.2 assuming Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. Let U, F, ξ and A be as in Lemma 5.2, and let d_*, μ and c be the positive numbers given by Lemma 5.4. Denote by σ_i, $1 \leq i \leq p$, the model 3-simplices of the triangulation Δ. Each of them contains a strictly convex sphere S_i in the μ-neighbourhood of its boundary. For every $d < d_*$, Lemma 5.4 provides a K-plane field $\bar{\xi}$ and a polyhedral neighbourhood A_d of A. Every 3-simplex σ of A_d contains a ball B_σ whose boundary is the image under a dilation of factor d of one of the model spheres S_i. Now for every d, the plane field $\bar{\xi}$ given by Lemma 5.4 satisfies: $\|\bar{\xi}_t \mid_{N_{\mu d}(A_d)}\|_1 \leq c$ for all $t \in K$. So according to Lemma 5.3, if d is chosen small enough, $\bar{\xi}$ is almost horizontal on every ball B_σ. The K-plane field $\bar{\xi}$, the compact set $G = G_d$, the neighbourhood $A_* = A_d$ of A and the bunch of balls B made of the B_σ meeting $A_d \cap G_d$ (so that $B \subset (\operatorname{Int} A_*) \setminus F$) satisfy all the properties of Lemma 5.2. □

Lemma 5.4 is by far the most technical result of this section. Its proof takes up the next two subsections.

5.4 Deformation model

Here we describe the deformation model we use in the next subsection in the neighbourhood of each simplex of the 2-skeleton. Our construction is directly inspired by that of Eliashberg in Lemma 2.3.2 of [El]. Let us warn the reader right now that Eliashberg's geometrical explanations are far more enlightening than the technical text presented here. In fact, the main *raison d'être* of this subsection is the following:

Remark 5.5. Despite Eliashberg's claim in [El, Note 2.3.3], the $\mathcal{C}^1$ norm of the plane field ξ^1 given by our deformation model is not controlled by the $\mathcal{C}^1$ norm of the initial plane field ξ but only by its $\mathcal{C}^2$ norm. More generally, the $\mathcal{C}^m$ norm of ξ^1 is controlled by the $\mathcal{C}^{m+1}$ norm of ξ. This « consumption » of one derivative complicates the calculations but does not affect the result: since the model is applied finitely many times, an appropriate bound on a $\mathcal{C}^m$ norm of the initial plane field with m sufficiently large will lead to the desired estimate on the $\mathcal{C}^1$ norm of the final plane field.

We work in $\mathbb{R}^3$ endowed with a triangulation $d\Delta$ but the euclidean coordinates we use are not the ones involved in the definition of Δ. We denote by V the $d\delta/2$-neighbourhood of a simplex σ of $d\Delta$, where δ is the minimal distance between two disjoint simplices of Δ. For every plane field ξ on V and every integer $m \geq 1$, we write

$$\|\xi\|_m = \max_{1\leq k\leq m} \sup_{p\in V} \big|D^k \xi^\perp(p)\big|,$$
$$\|\xi\|_{d,m} = \max_{1\leq k\leq m} d^{k-1} \sup_{p\in V} \big|D^k \xi^\perp(p)\big|.$$

We endow V with the horizontal foliation η defined by $dz = 0$ and the plane fields ξ we deform below satisfy the following condition:

$(*)$ the angle between the vectors $\xi^\perp$ and ∂_x is everywhere less than some fixed number $\tilde{\theta} \in (0, \pi/2)$.

In particular, ξ is transverse to η and the angle between the line field $\xi \cap \eta$ and ∂_y is everywhere less than $\tilde{\theta}$.

All the deformations of ξ we will define consist in rotating ξ around $\xi \cap \eta$ and have compact support in $\operatorname{Int} V$. We will thus refer to a plane field as *admissible* if it contains $\xi \cap \eta$ and coincides with ξ near the boundary ∂V.

Lemma 5.6. *Let ξ be a plane field on V satisfying the condition $(*)$ and S a properly embedded surface in V. Assume that $S \setminus \partial S$ contains a disk D transverse to $\xi \cap \eta$ whose orbit segments under $\xi \cap \eta$ cover the $2\mu d$-neighbourhood of σ and whose intersection $D \cap P$ with any leaf P of η is a connected curve whose angle with $\xi \cap \eta$ is greater than $\kappa > 0$. Then one can deform $\xi = \xi^0$ by a homotopy ξ^u, $u \in [0,1]$, of admissible plane fields satisfying the following properties:*

- *ξ^1 coincides with ξ along D and is integrable on the μd-neighbourhood of σ ;*
- *$\|\xi^u\|_{d,m} \leq \chi_m\big(\|\xi\|_{d,m+1}\big)$ for all $u \in [0,1]$ and all $m \geq 1$, where χ_m is a function depending on the numbers $\tilde{\theta}$, κ, μ and on (σ, D, η) but only up to scaling and thus not on d.*

Moreover, the homotopy ξ^u varies continuously with ξ.

Proof. Let C denote the flow cylinder of D under $\xi \cap \eta$. Since the intersection of D with every leaf of η is connected, by the Poincaré–Bendixson Theorem, no integral curve of $\xi \cap \eta$ returns to D. In other words, C is an « interval fibered bundle » over D. Now the key observation is that there is a unique integrable plane field $\bar{\xi}$ on C containing $\xi \cap \eta$ and coinciding with ξ at every point of D: the unique plane field invariant under the holonomy of $\xi \cap \eta$ and equal to ξ along D. The proof of Lemma 5.6 consists in measuring the variations of this plane field and then truncate it and connect it to ξ by some linear homotopy.

According to $(*)$, the plane field ξ admits a (unique) Pfaff equation of the form $\omega = dx + v\,dy + w\,dz$ and the functions v, w satisfy $v^2 + w^2 < \tan^2\tilde{\theta}$. With these notations, the Gauss map $\xi^\perp$ is given by

$$\xi^\perp = (1 + v^2 + w^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1, v, w).$$

Let $\nu = \partial_y - v\,\partial_x$ be the vector field spanning $\xi \cap \eta$ and satisfying $\nu \cdot y = 1$. Denote by $\phi\colon \Omega \subset \mathbb{R} \times V \to V$ its flow, $h\colon C \to \mathbb{R}$ the function which associates to every $p \in C$ the unique time t such that $\phi^t(p) \in D$, and $\bar{h}\colon C \to \mathbb{R} \times C$ the map $p \mapsto (h(p), p)$. Observe that the condition $\nu \cdot y = 1$ implies that Ω is contained in $[-2d, 2d] \times V$ and that the function $|h|$ is bounded by $2d$. The plane field $\bar{\xi}$ is the kernel of the form $\bar{\omega} = \bar{h}^* \phi^* \omega$.

The form $\phi^*\omega$ lives in the domain of definition $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R} \times V$ of the flow ϕ but since ω is zero along ν, the first component of $\phi^*\omega$ is zero. Thus the nonvanishing components of $\phi^*\omega$ define a map $\Phi\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and the map $\bar{\Phi}\colon C \to \mathbb{R}^3$ given by the components of $\bar{\omega}$ is none but $\bar{\Phi} = \Phi \circ \bar{h}$. In practice, if $F\colon V \to \mathbb{R}^3$ is the map representing ω, *i.e.* $F : p \mapsto (1, v(p), w(p))$, then Φ is given by a product of matrices:

$$\Phi(t, p) = (F \circ \phi)(t, p)\, D\phi^t(p).$$

We will now establish a series of estimates to measure the variations of Φ and $\bar{\Phi}$, making an extensive use of Faà di Bruno's Formula to compute higher order derivatives of composed functions:

$$D^m(f \circ g) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_m} \left(\left(D^{|\pi|} f \right) \circ g \cdot \prod_{B \in \pi} D^{|B|} g \right)$$

where Π_m denotes the set of partitions π of $\{1, \cdots, m\}$ and $|B|$ the number of elements of a block B of a partition π.

Throughout the calculations, given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the symbol χ_m denotes some universal function depending, as in the lemma, on the parameters $\tilde{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}$ and on (σ, D, η) only up to scaling (hence not on d), and which may change in the course of the argument.

First, the explicit expression of ν as a function of $\xi^\perp$ implies:

Claim 5.7. For all $m \geq 1$,

$$\|\nu\|_{d,m} \leq \chi_m\big(\|\xi\|_{d,m}\big).$$

As a matter of fact, $D^m\nu$ is bounded by a polynomial in the derivatives $D^k\xi^\perp$ for $1 \leq k \leq m$, the total degree of derivation of each monomial being m.

Claim 5.8. For all $m \geq 1$ and all $|t| \leq 2d \leq 2$,

$$d^{m-1} \|D^{m+1}\phi^t\|_0 \leq \chi_m\big(\|\xi\|_{d,m+1}\big).$$

Proof. The differential $D\phi^t(p)$ at any point p satisfies the variation equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} D\phi^t(p) = D\nu\big(\phi^t(p)\big)\, D\phi^t(p)$$

with the initial condition $D\phi^0(p) = \mathrm{id}$. The Gronwall inequality then implies:

$$\|D\phi^t\|_0 \leq \exp\big(|t| \|\nu\|_1\big) \leq \exp\big(2\|\nu\|_1\big), \qquad |t| \leq 2. \tag{1}$$

For every $m \geq 1$, the differential $D^{m+1}\phi^t(p)$ satisfies a linear differential equation as well:

$$\frac{d}{dt} D^{m+1}\phi^t(p) = D\nu\big(\phi^t(p)\big)\, D^{m+1}\phi^t(p) + \psi_t^m(p),$$
$$\text{where} \quad \psi_t^m(p) = \sum_{\substack{\pi \in \Pi_{m+1} \\ |\pi| \geq 2}} D^{|\pi|}\nu\big(\phi^t(p)\big) \prod_{B \in \pi} D^{|B|}\phi^t(p),$$

with the initial condition $D^{m+1}\phi^0(p) = 0$. We now prove Claim 5.8 by induction on m.

For $m = 1$, estimate (1) implies

$$d\|\psi_t^1\|_0 \leq d\|\nu\|_2 \exp\big(4\|\nu\|_1\big),$$

so $D^2\phi^t(p)$ satisfies a differential inequation

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}D^2\phi^t(p)\right| \leq \|\nu\|_1 \left|D^2\phi^t(p)\right| + d^{-1}\chi_1\big(\|\nu\|_{d,2}\big).$$

The Gronwall inequality then implies

$$\|D^2\phi^t\|_0 \leq cd^{-1}|t|\,\chi_1\big(\|\nu\|_{d,2}\big)$$

where the constant c satisfies $e^x - 1 \leq cx$ for $0 \leq x \leq 2\|\nu\|_1$. As a consequence, for $|t| \leq 2d$ and given Claim 5.7,

$$\|D^2\phi^t\|_0 \leq 2c\chi_1\big(\|\nu\|_{d,2}\big) = \chi_1\big(\|\xi\|_{d,2}\big).$$

For $m \geq 2$, first observe that

$$d^m\psi_t^m(p) = \sum_{\substack{\pi\in\Pi_{m+1}\\ |\pi|\geq 2}} d^{|\pi|-1}D^{|\pi|}\nu\big(\phi^t(p)\big)\prod_{B\in\pi} d^{|B|-1}D^{|B|}\phi^t(p)$$

so by the induction hypothesis,

$$d^m\|\psi_t^m\|_0 \leq \chi_m\big(\|\nu\|_{d,m+1}\big) \quad \text{for } |t| \leq 2d.$$

Thus on the interval $|t| \leq 2d$, the differential $D^{m+1}\phi^t(p)$ satisfies a differential inequation

$$\left|\frac{d}{dt}D^{m+1}\phi^t(p)\right| \leq \|\nu\|_1 \left|D^{m+1}\phi^t(p)\right| + d^{-m}\chi_m\big(\|\nu\|_{d,m+1}\big).$$

The Gronwall inequality then implies

$$d^{m-1}\|D^{m+1}\phi^t\|_0 \leq cd^{-1}|t|\chi_m\big(\|\nu\|_{d,m+1}\big) \leq \chi_m\big(\|\xi\|_{d,m+1}\big),$$

which concludes the proof. □

Claim 5.9. For all $m \geq 1$,

$$d^{m-1}\|D^m\Phi\|_0 \leq \chi_m\big(\|\xi\|_{d,m+1}\big).$$

Proof. When dealing with the map Φ, we denote by ∂ the space derivative, ∂_t the time derivative, and we consider an operator of the form $D^m = \partial^{m-i}\partial_t^i$. For all other maps, D denotes the usual (total) differential. We write

$$\partial_t^i\Phi = (F^{(i)} \circ \phi^t)D\phi^t$$

where $F^{(i)}$ is the map giving the coefficients of the i-th Lie derivative of ω in the direction of ν. Then $D^kF^{(i)}$ is bounded by a polynomial in the derivatives of $\xi^\perp$, the total order of derivation of each monomial being $k + i$.

Now,

$$D^m\Phi = \sum_{\pi\in\Pi_{m-i+1}} \left(D^{|\pi|-1}F^{(i)}\circ\phi^t \prod_{B\in\pi} D^{|B|}\phi^t \right)$$

so

$$d^{m-1}D^m\Phi = \sum_{\pi\in\Pi_{m-i+1}} \left(d^{|\pi|+i-2}D^{|\pi|-1}F^{(i)}\circ\phi^t \right) \left(d^{m-|\pi|-i+1} \prod_{B\in\pi} D^{|B|}\phi^t \right).$$

If $i \geq 1$, the first parenthesis can be bounded above by $\chi_{|\pi|+i-1}(\|\xi\|_{d,|\pi|+i-1})$ according to the above remark about the derivatives of $F^{(i)}$. To control the second parenthesis, we observe that

$$d^{m-|\pi|-i+1} = \prod_{B\in\pi} d^{|B|-1}$$

and apply Claim 5.8.

If $i = 0$, we need to isolate from the sum the unique partition π consisting of a single block of size $m+1$, the others being handled as above. The corresponding term is

$$d^{m-1}(F\circ\phi^t)D^{m+1}\phi^t$$

and we conclude using Claim 5.8 once again. □

Claim 5.10. For all $m \geq 1$,

$$d^{m-1}\|D^m\bar{h}\|_0 \leq \chi_m(\|\xi\|_{d,m+1}).$$

Proof. Since $h\circ\phi^t = h - t$, given Claim 5.8, we need only estimate the derivatives of $\bar{h}$ (*i.e* actually those of h) along S.

Let h_0 be the function defined in a neighbourhood of D whose restriction to every plane P of η is the algebraic distance to $S\cap P$, where S is cooriented so that h and h_0 have the same sign. Let $\nu_0 = f\nu$ where $f = \frac{1}{\nu\cdot h_0}$ and denote by ϕ_0^t its flow, defined on a neighbourhood Ω_0 of $\{0\}\times D$ in $\mathbb{R}\times V$. The flows ϕ_0^t and ϕ^t satisfy the relation

$$\phi_0^t(p) = \phi^{s(t,p)}(p)$$

where the function s satisfies $s(0,p) = 0$ for all $(0,p)\in\Omega_0$ and the differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}s(t,p) = f\left(\phi^{s(t,p)}(p)\right). \tag{2}$$

Since

$$\phi_0^{h_0(p)}(p) = \phi^{h(p)}(p) = \phi^{s(h_0(p),p)}(p),$$

we have $h(p) = s(h_0(p),p) = s\circ\bar{h}_0(p)$, where $\bar{h}_0(p) = (h_0(p),p)$. According to Faà di Bruno's formula, for $m\geq 1$,

$$D^m h = \sum_{\pi\in\Pi_m} \left(D^{|\pi|}s\circ\bar{h}_0 \prod_{B\in\pi} D^{|B|}\bar{h}_0 \right).$$

As in the proof of Claim 5.9, the total differential operator D for s splits into a temporal part ∂_t and a spatial part ∂. Since $s(0,p) = 0$ for all p close to D in C, the spatial derivatives $\partial^k s(0,p)$ are all zero. As a consequence, for $p \in D$, the above formula gives

$$D^m h(p) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_m} \left(\partial_t^{|\pi|} s(0,p) \prod_{B \in \pi} D^{|B|} h_0(p) \right),$$

and thus

$$d^{m-1} D^m h(p) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_m} \left(d^{|\pi|-1} \partial_t^{|\pi|} s(0,p) \right) \prod_{B \in \pi} \left(d^{|B|-1} D^{|B|} h_0(p) \right). \tag{3}$$

The quantities $d^{|B|-1} \|D^{|B|} h_0\|_0$ depend only on the geometry of S up to scaling. Moreover, Equation (2) can be written as

$$\partial_t s = (f \circ \phi) \circ \bar{s}$$

where $\bar{s}(t,p) = (s(t,p), p)$, so

$$\partial_t^{k+1} s = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_k} \left((\partial_\nu^{|\pi|} f \circ \phi) \circ \bar{s} \prod_{B \in \pi} \partial_t^{|B|} s \right),$$

where ∂_ν denotes the derivative in the direction of ν (in other words, $\partial_\nu f = \nu \cdot f$). Thus, for all $p \in D$,

$$d^k \partial_t^{k+1} s(0,p) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_k} \left(d^{|\pi|} \partial_\nu^{|\pi|} f(p) \right) \prod_{B \in \pi} \left(d^{|B|-1} \partial_t^{|B|} s(0,p) \right). \tag{4}$$

Now $f = \frac{1}{\partial_\nu h_0}$ and $\partial_\nu h_0(p)$, for all $p \in D$, is the scalar product of $\nu(p)$ with the unit normal vector to $S \cap P$ in P, where P is the horizontal plane containing p. The function $\partial_\nu h_0$ is thus bounded below along D by some constant depending only on $\hat{\theta}$ and $\tilde{\theta}$. Moreover, every quantity $d^l \|\partial_\nu^{l+1} h_0\|_0$ is bounded above by a function of $\|\nu\|_{d,l}$ (which depends on S only up to scaling). Thus, every quantity $d^{|\pi|} \|\partial_\nu^{|\pi|} f|_D\|_0$ is itself bounded above by $\|\nu\|_{d,|\pi|}$, and Relation (4) shows by induction that the quantities $d^{k-1} |\partial_t^k s(0,p)|$ are controlled by $\|\nu\|_{d,k}$. Formula (3) and Claim 5.7 thus imply Claim 5.10. □

Claim 5.11. For all $m \geq 1$,

$$d^{m-1} \|D^m \bar{\Phi}\|_0 \leq \chi_m\big(\|\xi\|_{d,m+1}\big).$$

Proof. Simply write

$$d^{m-1} D^m \bar{\Phi} = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_m} \left(d^{|\pi|-1} D^{|\pi|} \Phi \circ \bar{h} \right) \left(\prod_{B \in \pi} d^{|B|-1} D^{|B|} \bar{h} \right)$$

and apply Claims 5.9 and 5.10 to the first and second parentheses respectively.

□

The above Claim shows that $\left\|\bar{\xi}\right\|_{d,m} \leq \chi_m(\|\xi\|_{d,m+1})$.

Now let $\rho : V \to [0,1]$ be a function equal to 1 on $N_{\mu d}(\sigma)$, with support in $N_{2\mu d}(\sigma)$ and satisfying

$$d^{m-1} \left\|D^m \rho\right\|_0 \leq c_m \quad \text{for all } m \geq 1,$$

where the constants c_m do not depend on d. For all $u \in [0,1]$, set:

$$\omega^u = (1 - u\rho)\omega + u\rho\bar{\omega}.$$

Observe that these forms are all nonsingular, for ω and $\bar{\omega}$ are positive on ∂_x. The plane fields ξ^u defined by the forms ω^u have all the desired properties. □

Remark 5.12. Note that, if the plane field ξ is already integrable on a region of the form $C' = \{\phi^t(p),\ p \in D',\ t \in [a(p), b(p)]\}$ for some domain $D' \subset D$ and some functions $a, b \colon D' \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $a \leq 0 \leq b$, then the homotopy ξ^u of Lemma 5.6 is stationary on C'.

5.5 Proof of the Key Lemma 5.4

We start with the data U, F, A and ξ of Lemma 5.4 and use the notations of Section 5.3. In particular, Δ is the $(2\mathbb{Z})^3$-invariant triangulation of $\mathbb{R}^3$ obtained by « jiggling » the barycentric subdivision of the crystalline triangulation with integer vertices. By periodicity of the construction, Δ has a finite number of *model* simplices, meaning that every simplex of Δ is the image of one of those by a translation. The diameter of the simplices of Δ is less than 1. Moreover, the distance between two disjoint simplices and the angle between two intersecting 1 or 2-simplices (not contained into one another) are uniformly bounded below by numbers denoted $\delta > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, \pi/2]$ respectively (the angle between a straight line and a plane is the angle between the straight line and its orthogonal projection on the plane).

Fix an angle $\theta < \gamma/2$.

Polyhedral neighbourhoods

We still (improperly) call « cube » of $d\Delta$ every subcomplex coming from a cube which has been subdivided, « jiggled » and scaled. Since A is a compact subset of U, for $d_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, $N_{2d_0}(A)$ is contained in U and ξ is integrable on $K \times N_{2d_0}(F \cap A)$. Fix such a d_0. In what follows, given a plane field ζ on U, $\|\zeta\|_k$ denotes the $\mathcal{C}^k$-norm of the restriction of ζ to $N_{2d_0}(A)$.

Given $d < d_0/4$, we denote by A_d and F_d the subcomplexes of $d\Delta$ made up of all the « cubes » meeting $N_{d_0}(A)$ and $N_{d_0}(F \cap A)$ respectively. Thus, since $d_0 + 3d < 2d_0$,

$$N_{d_0}(A) \subset A_d \subset N_d(A_d) \subset N_{2d_0}(A)$$
$$\text{and} \quad N_{d_0}(F \cap A) \subset F_d \subset N_d(F_d) \subset N_{2d_0}(F \cap A)$$

so, in particular, ξ is integrable on $K \times N_d(F_d)$.

Remark 5.13. Every 2-simplex of A_d not contained in F_d has at most one edge in F_d. Indeed, let σ be such a 2-simplex and Q the cube of A_d containing it. By assumption, this cube is not contained in F_d, so $\sigma \cap F_d \subset \sigma \cap \partial Q$. Since the triangulation Δ is obtained by barycentric subdivision, there are two cases:

- if σ has a vertex in the interior of Q, it has at most one edge in ∂Q ;
- otherwise, $\sigma \subset \partial Q$ has a vertex q in the interior of some « square face » of Q; either $q \in F_d$ and then $\sigma \subset F_d$ (for $F_d \cap Q$ is a union of « square faces »), or $q \notin F_d$ and then σ has at most one edge in F_d.

Subdivision of the parameter space

We now consider a subdivision of the parameter space K compatible with L and so fine that the following inequality holds on every simplex K_* :

$$\angle(\xi_s(p), \xi_t(p)) < \frac{\theta}{16} \quad \text{for all } s,\, t \in K_* \text{ and } p \in N_{2d_0}(A). \tag{$\measuredangle_0$}$$

For $0 \leq i \leq n$, where $n = \dim K$, denote by K^i the union of the i-skeleton of the triangulation with the subcomplex L. We also write $K^{-1} = L$. The Key Lemma 5.4 is a consequence of the following result.

Lemma 5.14. *For every $0 \leq i \leq n+1$, there are positive numbers d_i, μ_i and $(c_{i,m})_{m\geq 1}$ such that, for every $d < d_i$, there exists a homotopy ξ^u, $u \in [0,i]$, of K^{i-1}-plane fields on U with the following properties*

- *ξ^0 coincides with ξ (or more accurately with its restriction to $K^{i-1} \times U$) and the homotopy is relative to $(K^{i-1} \times (U \setminus G_d^i)) \cup (L \times U)$ where G_d^i is compact and disjoint from $N_{\mu_i d}(F_d)$;*
- *ξ^i is integrable on $K^{i-1} \times N_{\mu_i d}(A_d^2)$;*
- *for every $(t,u) \in K^{i-1} \times [0,i]$,*

$$\|\xi_t^u\|_{d,m} \leq c_{i,m} \; ; \tag{$\dagger_i$}$$

- *for every $(t,u) \in K^{i-1} \times [0,i]$ and every $p \in U$,*

$$\angle(\xi_t^u(p), \xi_t(p)) < \frac{\theta}{32}.$$

Proof of the Key Lemma 5.4. For $i = n+1$, the above lemma implies the Key Lemma with $d_* = d_{n+1}$, $\mu = \mu_{n+1}$, $c = c_{n+1,1}$ et $G_d = G_d^{n+1}$. □

Proof of Lemma 5.14. It will take up the rest of this subsection 5.5 (and of the article). We proceed by induction. Step $i = 0$ is trivial (with $\mu_0 = 1$) since the plane fields ξ_t, $t \in K^{-1} = L$, are integrable on all of U.

Assume now that step $i \geq 0$ has been completed. Taking d_i smaller if necessary, we assume that

$$d_i c_{i,1} < \frac{\theta}{16}. \tag{$\diamond_i$}$$

For $d < d_i$, we take a homotopy ξ^u, $u \in [0,i]$, of K^{i-1}-plane fields given by step i and more specifically satisfying for all $(t,u) \in K^{i-1} \times [0,i]$ and all $p \in U$

$$\angle(\xi_t^u(p), \xi_t(p)) < \frac{\theta}{32} - \beta \quad \text{with } \beta > 0. \tag{$\ddagger_i$}$$

We first extend this homotopy « in a trivial way » to a homotopy of K^i-plane fields stationary outside a neighbourhood of K^{i-1}. According to $(\measuredangle_0)$ and $(\ddagger_i)$, for all s, t in a same simplex K_* of K^i and all $p \in U$,

$$\angle(\xi_t^i(p), \xi_s^i(p)) < \frac{\theta}{8}. \qquad (\measuredangle_i)$$

We will now build a homotopy ξ^{i+u}, $u \in [0,1]$, of K^i-plane fields relative to $K^{i-1} \times U$. For every i-simplex K_* of K^i (not contained in L), we will apply Lemma 5.6 to the neighbourhood of each simplex of the 2-skeleton of A_d not contained in F_d, taking these simplices in a suitable order: we first deal with the "special" simplices (cf. Definition 5.15 below), then with the vertices contained in no such simplex, then with the edges, and finally with the non special faces.

From now on we fix an i-simplex K_* (not contained in L).

Special simplices

Definition 5.15. We will call a 2-simplex σ of A_d *special* if it is not contained in F_d and if there exists $(s, q) \in K_* \times \sigma$ such that $\angle(\sigma, \xi_s^i(q)) < \theta/2$.

Claim 5.16. If σ is a special simplex,

$$\angle(\sigma, \xi_t^i(p)) < \theta \quad \text{for all } (t,p) \in K_* \times N_d(\sigma).$$

In particular, special simplices are disjoint.

Proof. If $(s, q) \in K_* \times \sigma$ is such that $\angle(\sigma, \xi_s^i(q)) < \theta/2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\angle(\sigma, \xi_t^i(p)) &\le \angle(\sigma, \xi_s^i(q)) + \angle(\xi_s^i(q), \xi_s^i(p)) + \angle(\xi_s^i(p), \xi_t^i(p)) \\
&< \frac{\theta}{2} + \left\|\xi_s^i\right\|_1 |q - p| + \frac{\theta}{8} \quad \text{according to } (\measuredangle_i), \\
&< \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{16 d_i} \times 2d + \frac{\theta}{8} \quad \text{according to } (\dagger_i) \text{ and } (\diamond_i), \\
&< \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{8} + \frac{\theta}{8} < \theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Now assume that σ and σ' are non disjoint special simplices. Let $s, s' \in K_*$ and $q \in \sigma$, $q' \in \sigma'$ be such that

$$\angle(\sigma, \xi_s^i(q)) < \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \angle(\sigma', \xi_{s'}^i(q')) < \frac{\theta}{2}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\angle(\sigma, \sigma') &\le \angle(\sigma, \xi_s^i(q)) + \angle(\xi_s^i(q), \xi_s^i(q')) + \angle(\xi_s^i(q'), \xi_{s'}^i(q')) + \angle(\xi_{s'}^i(q'), \sigma') \\
&< \frac{\theta}{2} + \left\|\xi_s^i\right\|_1 |q - q'| + \frac{\theta}{8} + \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \text{according to } (\measuredangle_i), \\
&< \frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{16 d_i} \times 2d + \frac{\theta}{8} + \frac{\theta}{2} \quad \text{according to } (\dagger_i) \text{ and } (\diamond_i), \\
&< 2\theta < \gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of γ, the simplices σ and σ' coincide. □

We now explain how to apply the deformation model in the neighbourhood of each simplex of A^2_d. As a matter of fact, we proceed exactly like Eliashberg in [El] and we will simply discribe the objects to which we apply Lemma 5.6. As already mentionned, we first deal with special simplices, then vertices, then edges and finally non special faces.

Deformation near special simplices

Let σ be a special simplex, V its $d\delta/2$-neighbourhood and α any edge of σ containing $\sigma \cap F_d$ (cf. Remark 5.13). We choose some adapted coordinates: the origin is the middle q of α, the vector $\partial_y(q)$ is tangent to σ and points to the vertex opposite α, and the vector $\partial_x(q)$ is orthogonal to σ.



Figure 17: Choice of coordinates near a special simplex σ

With these choices, ξ^i_t, $t \in K_*$, satisfies condition $(*)$ of Section 5.4 with $\tilde{\theta} = \theta$ since, for all $(t,p) \in K_* \times N_d(\sigma) \supset K_* \times V$,

$$\angle(\xi^{i\perp}_t, \partial_x(p)) = \angle(\xi^i_t(p), \sigma) < \theta \quad \text{according to Claim 5.16.}$$

As in Section 5.4, η denotes the plane field defined by $dz = 0$. By the induction hypothesis, the plane field ξ^i_t is integrable on $N_{\mu_i d}(\sigma)$ for $t \in \partial K_*$ and on $N_{\mu_i d}(F_d)$ for $t \in K_*$. We denote by S the smooth boundary of some stricly convex domain containing $N_{9\mu_i d/10}(\sigma)$, contained in $N_{\mu_i d}(\sigma)$ and independent of d up to scaling.

Claim 5.17. There are positive numbers $d_{i+1/4}$, μ and κ such that for all $d < d_{i+1/4}$ and all $t \in K_*$, the surface S contains a disk D_t varying continuously with t and satisfying the following properties:

- D_t is transverse to $\xi^i_t \cap \eta$ and its orbit segments under $\xi^i_t \cap \eta$ cover the $2\mu d$-neighbourhood of σ ;
- $D_t \cap P$ is connected for every leaf P of η and its angle with $\xi^i_t \cap \eta$ is at least κ.



Proof. Let $\nu_t\colon V \to \mathbb{S}^1$, $t \in K_*$, be the unit vector field spanning $\xi^i_t \cap \eta$. Condition $(*)$ ensures as in Subsection 5.4 (cf. Claim 5.7) that

$$\|\nu_t\|_1 \leq c_\theta \|\xi^i_t\|_1 \quad (\leq c_\theta c_{i,1} = c \quad \text{according to } (\dagger_i)),$$

where the constant c_θ depends only on θ. Let P be a leaf of η and $\gamma\colon S \cap P \to \mathbb{S}^1$ the Gauss map of $S \cap P$. Since the curvature of $S \cap P$ is bounded below by k/d for some constant k (independent of P), the maps $\pm\nu_t \circ \gamma^{-1}\colon \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{S}^1$ are contractions for d sufficiently small (cf. proof of Lemma 5.3), and thus each have a unique fixed point. These fixed points (call them « poles ») divide $S \cap P$ into two intervals: an entrance zone and an exit zone for ν_t. Moreover, for every point p in $S \cap P$ at least εd-distant from the poles, the angle between $\nu_t(p)$ and the tangent to $S \cap P$ is greater than $(k - cd)\varepsilon$. Besides, the intersection of the flow cylinder of the εd-neighbourhood of the poles with the oval bounded by $S \cap P$ is confined in the $2\varepsilon d$-neighbourhood of the poles provided ε is sufficiently small.

When P runs over the leaves of η, the poles of ν_t on $S \cap P$ trace a curve which divides S into an entrance face S^-_t and an exit face S^+_t. The claim then follows from the above observations, taking D_t to be the surface S^-_t with a neighbourhood of its boundary removed. □

Claim 5.18. Taking μ smaller if necessary, there exists, for every $t \in K_*$, a disk $D'_t \subset D_t$ such that the orbit segments of $\xi^i_t \cap \eta$ starting from D'_t and entirely contained in $N_{\mu_i d}(F_d \cap \sigma)$ cover $N_{2\mu d}(\sigma) \cap N_{\mu d}(F_d)$.

Proof. First observe that given $\bar{\mu} \in [0, \mu_i]$, there exists μ such that

$$N_{2\mu d}(\sigma) \cap N_{\mu d}(F_d) \subset N_{\bar{\mu} d}(F_d \cap \sigma).$$

Now set $D'_t = D_t \cap N_{\mu_i d}(F_d \cap \sigma)$. We are going to show using the figure below that the union of orbit segments of $\xi^i_t \cap \eta$ starting from D'_t and entirely contained in $N_{\mu_i d}(F_d \cap \sigma)$ contains $N_{\bar{\mu} d}(F_d \cap \sigma)$ for some $\bar{\mu} \in [0, \mu_i]$ which does not depend on t.



Figure 18: Proof of Claim 5.18

The figure represents the trace of S, σ, $F_d \cap \sigma$, etc. in a plane P of the foliation η, in the particular case when η is orthogonal to the edge α (in the general case, the picture is obtained from this one by a distorsion of bounded factor so that the same arguments apply). The region R of S materialized by a continuous thick line is contained in D'_t. Indeed, R is contained in $N_{\mu_i d}(F_d \cap \sigma)$ and at every point of R, the tangent to S makes an

angle greater than $\theta+\kappa$ with the horizontal direction, and thus greater than κ with $\xi_t^i \cap \eta$ (according to condition $(*)$). Hence R is contained in D_t. Assuming we initially imposed $\theta < 1/2(\pi/2 - \arccos(9/10))$, and decreasing κ if necessary, we have

$$\theta < \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta - \kappa - \arccos\left(\frac{9}{10}\right) \quad \text{(cf. Figure 18)}.$$

Since $\xi_t^i \cap \eta$ makes an angle less than θ with the horizontal direction, the union of its orbit segments starting from $R \subset D_t'$ and contained in $N_{\mu_i d}(F_d \cap \sigma)$ covers the (dotted) cone consisting of all segments joining $q \in \sigma$ to R. This union thus contains a $\bar{\mu}d$-neighbourhood of $F_d \cap \sigma$ for $\bar{\mu}$ sufficiently small (independent of t). □

Claim 5.17 shows that if $d \leq d_{i+1/4}$, the hypotheses of Lemma 5.6 are satisfied by every plane field ξ_t^i, $t \in K_*$, for the constants μ and κ. Setting $\mu_{i+1/4} = \mu$, we thus obtain a homotopy ξ^u, $u \in [i, i+1/4]$, of K_*-plane fields with the following properties:

- ξ_t^u coincides with ξ_t^i outside of $N_{2\mu_{i+1/4}d}(\sigma)$;
- $\xi_t^{i+1/4}$ is integrable on the $\mu_{i+1/4}d$-neighbourhood of σ ;
- for every $m \geq 1$, there exists a constant $c_{i+1/4,m}$ such that $\|\xi_t^u\|_{d,m} \leq c_{i+1/4,m}$ for all $(t,u) \in K_* \times [0, i+1/4]$.

Reducing $d_{i+1/4}$ if necessary so that

$$2d_{i+1/4}c_{i+1/4,1} < \frac{\beta}{4}, \qquad (\diamond_{i+1/4})$$

we can assume the angle variation of each ξ_t^u on $V = N_{d\delta/2}(\sigma)$ is less than $\beta/8$. Then for all $(t,u) \in K_* \times [i, i+1/4]$ and all $p \in V$,

$$\angle(\xi_t^u(p), \xi_t^i(p)) < \frac{\beta}{4}. \qquad (\diamond\diamond_{i+1/4})$$

Indeed, if $q \in V \setminus N_{2\mu_{i+1/4}d}(\sigma)$,

$$\angle(\xi_t^u(p), \xi_t^i(p)) \leq \angle(\xi_t^u(p), \xi_t^u(q)) + \angle(\xi_t^u(q), \xi_t^i(q)) + \angle(\xi_t^i(q), \xi_t^i(p)) < \frac{\beta}{8} + 0 + \frac{\beta}{8}.$$

Inequalities $(\ddagger_i)$ and $(\diamond\diamond_{i+1/4})$ imply, for all $(t,u) \in K_* \times [0, i+1/4]$ and all $p \in U$,

$$\angle(\xi_t^u(p), \xi_t(p)) < \frac{\theta}{32} - \frac{3\beta}{4}. \qquad (\ddagger_{i+1/4})$$

For $t \in \partial K_*$, Remark 5.12 shows that the homotopy ξ_t^u, $u \in [i, i+1/4]$, is completely stationary. Indeed, the intersection of the flow cylinder of D_t with the domain bounded by S (which contains the support of the homotopy) is an interval fiber bundle over D_t on which ξ_t^i is assumed to be already integrable for every $t \in \partial K_* \subset K^{i-1}$.

Besides, the same remark together with Claim 5.18 show that for every $t \in K_*$, the homotopy ξ_t^u is stationary on $N_{\mu_{i+1/4}d}(F_d)$.

Since the neighbourhoods $V = N_{d\delta/2}(\sigma)$ of the different special simplices σ are disjoint (by definition of δ and according to Claim 5.16), we can apply Lemma 5.6 to all of them simultaneously and we obtain constants $d_{i+1/4}$, $\mu_{i+1/4}$ and $c_{i+1/4,m}$ independent of σ.

Deformation near the other simplices

Now let q be a vertex of A_d belonging neither to F_d nor to any special simplex, and V its $d\delta/2$-neighbourhood. Note that V is disjoint from the $d\delta/2$-neighbourhoods of the special simplices, so that $\xi_t^{i+1/4}$ coincides with ξ_t^i on V for every $t \in K_*$. For S, take the intersection of V with a plane perpendicular to $\xi_s^{i+1/4}(q)$ for some $s \in K_*$. Define the coordinate axes as follows:

- $\partial_y(q) \in \xi_s^{i+1/4}(q)$ is orthogonal to S ;
- $\partial_x(q) \in T_qS$ is orthogonal to $\xi_s^{i+1/4}(q)$.



Figure 19: Choice of coordinates near a vertex q

Combining $(\measuredangle_0)$, $(\diamond_{i+1/4})$ and $(\ddagger_{i+1/4})$, one can check that condition $(*)$ is satisfied by every $\xi_t^{i+1/4}$, $t \in K_*$, for $\tilde{\theta} = \theta/8$. With these notations, one easily proves an analogue of Claim 5.17, which provides numbers $d_{i+1/2}$, $\mu = \mu_{i+1/2}$, $\kappa = \pi/2 - \theta/8$ and disks D_t which can be taken independent of t and contained in the $\mu_{i+1/4}d$-neighbourhood of q. Lemma 5.6 then gives a homotopy ξ^u, $u \in [i+1/4, i+1/2]$, of K_*-plane fields with the following properties:

- ξ_t^u coincides with $\xi_t^{i+1/4}$ outside of $N_{2\mu_{i+1/2}d}(q)$;
- $\xi_t^{i+1/2}$ is integrable on the $\mu_{i+1/2}d$-neighbourhood of q ;
- for every $m \geq 1$, there is a constant $c_{i+1/2,m}$ such that $\|\xi_t^u\|_{d,m} \leq c_{i+1/2,m}$ for all $(t,u) \in K_* \times [0, i+1/2]$.

Reducing $d_{i+1/2}$ if necessary so that

$$2d_{i+1/2}c_{i+1/2,1} < \frac{\beta}{4}, \qquad (\diamond_{i+1/2})$$

one can make sure (as for special simplices) that for all $(t,u) \in K_* \times [i+1/4, i+1/2]$ and all $p \in V$,

$$\angle(\xi_t^u(p), \xi_t^{i+1/4}(p)) < \frac{\beta}{4}. \qquad (\diamond\diamond_{i+1/2})$$

Inequalities $(\ddagger_{i+1/4})$ and $(\diamond\diamond_{i+1/2})$ imply, for all $(t,u) \in K_* \times [0, i+1/2]$,

$$\angle(\xi_t^u(p), \xi_t(p)) < \frac{\theta}{32} - \frac{\beta}{2}. \qquad (\ddagger_{i+1/2})$$

For $t \in \partial K_*$, Remark 5.12 shows once again that the homotopy ξ_t^u, $u \in [i+1/4, i+1/2]$, is completely stationary, D_t being contained in $N_{\mu_{i+1/4}d}(q)$. As for special simplices, we apply Lemma 5.6 simultaneously near all vertices.



Figure 20: Choice of coordinates near an edge α

We now consider an edge α of A_d contained neither in F_d nor in any special simplex and we denote by V its $d\delta/2$-neighbourhood. For the surface S, we take the intersection of V with the plane containing α and perpendicular to $\xi_s^{i+1/2}(q)$ for some $s \in K_*$. The adapted coordinates are as follows: the origin q is the middle of α, the vector $\partial_y(q) \in \xi_s^{i+1/2}(q)$ is orthogonal to S and the vector $\partial_x(q) \in T_qS$ is orthogonal to $\xi_s^{i+1/2}(q)$.

According to $(\measuredangle_0)$, $(\diamond_{i+1/2})$ and $(\ddagger_{i+1/2})$, condition $(*)$ is satisfied by every $\xi_t^{i+1/2}$, $t \in K_*$, with $\tilde{\theta} = \theta/8$. Here again, one can prove an analogue of Claim 5.17, which provides numbers $d_{i+3/4}$, $\mu = \mu_{i+3/4}$, $\kappa = \pi/2 - \theta/8$ and disks D_t which can be taken independent of t and contained in the $\mu_{i+1/2}d$-neighbourhood of α.

Lemma 5.6 then gives a homotopy ξ^u, $u \in [i+1/2, i+3/4]$, of K_*-plane fields with the properties one might guess. In particular, for every $t \in \partial K_*$, Remark 5.12 shows once again that the homotopy ξ_t^u, $u \in [i+1/2, i+3/4]$, is completely stationary. Besides, for all $t \in K_*$, every integral curve of $\xi_t^{i+1/2} \cap \eta$ intersecting D_t meets $N_{\mu_{i+1/2}d}(\partial\alpha)$ along an interval, for $N_{\mu_{i+1/2}d}(\partial\alpha)$ is made of two strictly convex balls. It then follows from the same Remark 5.12 that $\xi_t^u = \xi_t^{i+1/2}$ on $N_{\mu_{i+1/2}d}(\partial\alpha)$ for all $u \in [i+1/2, i+3/4]$. In other words, the deformation changes nothing in the $\mu_{i+1/2}d$-neighbourhood of the 0-skeleton. One can thus perform the deformations simultaneously near all edges.

Finally, let σ be a nonspecial face of A_d not contained in F_d, and V its $d\delta/2$-neighbourhood. For the surface S, take the intersection of V with the plane containing σ, and for the origin q take the center of σ. We fix the coordinate axes as follows:

- $\partial_y(q)$ belongs to $\xi_s^{i+3/4}(q)$ for some $s \in K_*$ and has a maximal angle with σ ;
- $\partial_x(q)$ is orthogonal to $\xi_s^{i+3/4}(q)$.

Here again, every $\xi_t^{i+3/4}$, $t \in K_*$, satisfies condition $(*)$ for $\tilde{\theta} = \theta/8$. Moreover, σ being nonspecial, $\angle(\xi_t^i(p), \sigma) \geq \theta/2$ for all $(t,p) \in K_* \times \sigma$. Inequalities $(\diamond\diamond_{i+k/4})$, $1 \leq k \leq 3$, and

$(\diamond_{i+3/4})$ (left as an exercise to the reader) imply that $\angle(\xi_t^{i+3/4}(p), \sigma) \geq \theta/2 - \beta \geq \theta/4$ for all $(t, p) \in K_* \times V$.



Figure 21: Choice of coordinates near a face σ

Using this observation, one can prove an analogue of Claim 5.17, which provides numbers d_{i+1}, $\mu = \mu_{i+1}$, $\kappa = \theta/4$ and disks D_t which can be taken independent of t and contained in the $\mu_{i+3/4}d$-neighbourhood of σ. Lemma 5.6 then gives a homotopy ξ^u, $u \in [i + 3/4, i + 1]$, of K_*-plane fields with the properties one might guess. Since every integral curve of $\xi_t^{i+3/4} \cap \eta$ which intersects D_t meets the $\mu_{i+3/4}$-neighbourhood of each edge of σ along an interval, the deformation does not affect $N_{\mu_{i+3/4}d}(\partial\sigma)$. One can thus once again (and for the last time) make the modifications simultaneously on all faces.

Carrying out this construction for every i-simplex K_* of K^i, we finally obtain a homotopy ξ^u, $u \in [0, i+1]$, of K^i-plane fields on U, which concludes step $i+1$ of the induction (with $G_d^i \subset N_{d\delta/2}(A_d^2) \setminus N_{\mu_{i+1}d}(F_d)$).

References

[B–E] C. Bonatti and H. Eynard — *Connectedness of the space of smooth actions of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ on the interval* . Preprint arXiv:1209.1601.

[B–F] C. Bonatti and S. Firmo — *Feuilles compactes d'un feuilletage générique en codimension 1.* (French. English, French summary) [Compact leaves of a generic foliation in codimension 1] Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **27** (1994), no. 4, 407–462.

[B–H] C. Bonatti and A. Haefliger — *Déformations de feuilletages.* (French) [Deformations of foliations] Topology **29** (1990), no. 2, 205–229.

[Bo] J. Bowden — *Contact structures, deformations and taut foliations.* Preprint arXiv:1304.3833.

[C–C1] A. Candel et L. Conlon — *Foliations I.* Grad. Studies in Math. **23** (2000).

[C–C2] J. Cantwell et L. Conlon — *Leaves with isolated ends in foliated 3-manifolds.* Topology **16** (1977), no. 4, 311?322.

[Ce] J. Cerf — *Sur les difféomorphismes de la sphère de dimension trois* ($\Gamma_4 = 0$). Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics **53**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1968).

[El] Y. Eliashberg — *Classification of overtwisted contact structures on* 3*-manifolds.* Invent. Math. **98** (1989), 623–637.

[E–M] Y. Eliashberg and N. Mishachev — *Introduction to the h-Principle.* Graduate Studies in Math. **48** (2002).

[Ey] H. Eynard-Bontemps — *Sur deux questions de connexité concernant les feuilletages et leurs holonomies.* Thèse ENS Lyon 2009. http://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00436304/fr/

[Ge] H. Geiges — *An Introduction to Contact Topology.* Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics **109** (2008).

[Go] S. Goodman — *Closed leaves in foliations of codimension one.* Comment. Math. Helvetici **50** (1975), 383–388.

[He1] M. R. Herman — *Simplicité du groupe des difféomorphismes de classe $\mathcal{C}^\infty$, isotopes à l'identité, du tore de dimension n.* (French) C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B **273** 1971 A232–A234. .

[He2] M. R. Herman — *Sur la conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle à des rotations.* Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **49** (1979), 5–233.

[Ko] N. Kopell — *Commuting diffeomorphisms.* In *Global Analysis*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. XIV, Amer. Math. Soc. (1968), 165–184.

[La] A. Larcanché — *Topologie locale des espaces de feuilletages en surfaces des variétés fermées de dimension 3.* Comment. Math. Helvetici **82** (2007), 385–411.

[Li] W. B. R. Lickorish — *A foliation for* 3*-manifolds.* Ann. of Math. (2) **82** (1965), 414–420.

[Na] A. Navas — *Groups of circle diffeomorphisms*, chapter 4. Arxiv.

[No] S. P. Novikov — *Topology of foliations.* Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **14** (1965), 248–278 (Russian), A.M.S Translation (1967), 268–304.

[Ph] A. Phillips — *Submersions of open manifolds.* Topology **6** (1967), 171–206.

[Re] G. Reeb — *Sur certaines propriétés topologiques des variétés feuilletées.* Actual. Sci. Ind. **1183**, Hermann, Paris (1977).

[Sc] P. Schweitzer — *Codimension one foliations without compact leaves.* Comm. Math. Helv. **70** (1995), 171 – 209.

[Se] F. Sergeraert — *Feuilletages et difféomorphismes infiniment tangents à l'identité.* Invent. Math. **39** (1977), 253–275.

[Sz] G. Szekeres — *Regular iteration of real and complex functions.* Acta Math. **100** (1958), 203–258.

[Ta] F. Takens — *Normal forms for certain singularities of vector fields.* Ann. Inst. Fourier **23** (1973), 163–195.

[Th1] W. P. Thurston — *Foliations of Three-Manifolds Which are Circle Bundles.* Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley (1967).

[Th2] W. P. Thurston — *A local construction of foliations for three-manifolds.* Differential topology (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **27**, Stanford Univ., California, 1973), Amer. Math. Soc. (1975), 315–319.

[Th3] W. P. Thurston — *The theory of foliations of codimension greater than one.* Comm. Math. Helv. **49** (1974), 214–231.

[Th4] W. P. Thurston — *Existence of codimension-one foliations.* Ann. of Math. (2) **104** (1976), no. 2, 249–268.

[Vo] T. Vogel — *Uniqueness of the contact structure approximating a foliation.* Preprint arXiv:1302.5672

[Wo] J. Wood — *Foliations on 3-manifolds.* Ann. of Math. **89** (1969), 336–358.

[Yo] J-C. Yoccoz — *Conjugaison différentiable des difféomorphismes du cercle dont le nombre de rotation vérifie une condition diophantienne.* Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **17** (1984), 333–359.